arXiv:0812.4338v5 [math-ph] 12 Jan 2010

STOCHASTIC AND DETERMINISTIC MOLECULAR DYNAMICS DERIVED FROM THE TIME-INDEPENDENT SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

ANDERS SZEPESSY

ABSTRACT. Ehrenfest, Born-Oppenheimer, Langevin and Smoluchowski dynamics are shown to be accurate approximations of time-independent Schrödinger observables for a molecular system avoiding caustics, in the limit of large ratio of nuclei and electron masses, without assuming that the nuclei are localized to vanishing domains. The derivation, based on a Hamiltonian system interpretation of the Schrödinger equation and stability of the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi equation, bypasses the usual separation of nuclei and electron wave functions, includes crossing electron eigenvalues, and gives a different perspective on the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, Schrödinger Hamiltonian systems, stochastic electron equilibrium states and numerical simulation in molecular dynamics modeling.

CONTENTS

1. The Schrödinger and molecular dynamics models 2
2. Ehrenfest dynamics derived from the time-independent Schrödinger equation 6
2.1. Exact Schrödinger dynamics 6
2.2. Approximate Ehrenfest dynamics and densities 9
2.3. Comparison of two alternative Ehrenfest formulations 10
2.4. Equations for the density 11
2.5. Construction of the solution operator 13
3. The time-dependent Schrödinger equation 14
4. Surface-hopping and multiple states 14
4.1. Surface-hopping and Ehrenfest dynamics for multiple states 15
5. Computation of observables 15
6. Approximation of a deterministic WKB state by Hamiltonian dynamics 16
6.1. The Ehrenfest approximation error 16
6.2. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation error 17
7. Analysis of the molecular dynamics approximation 18
7.1. Spectral decomposition 19
7.2. Schrödinger eigenvalues as a Hamiltonian system 20
7.3. Stability from perturbed Hamiltonians 21
7.4. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation 23
7.5. The stationary phase method 26
7.6. Error estimates for the densities 29
8. Approximation of stochastic WKB states by stochastic dynamics 29
9. Discrete spectrum 34
References 35

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 81Q20; Secondary: 82C10.

Key words and phrases. Born-Oppenheimer approximation, WKB expansion, quantum classical molecular dynamics, foundations of quantum mechanics, Schrödinger operators.

1. The Schrödinger and molecular dynamics models

The *time-independent Schrödinger* equation

$$H(x,X)\Phi(x,X) = E\Phi(x,X), \tag{1.1}$$

models nuclei-electron systems and is obtained from minimization of the energy in the solution space of wave functions, cf. [48, 47, 3, 50, 10]. It is an eigenvalue problem for the energy $E \in \mathbf{R}$ of the system in the solution space, described by wave functions, $\Phi : \mathbf{R}^{3J} \times \mathbf{R}^{3N} \to \mathbb{C}$, depending on electron coordinates $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^J) \in \mathbf{R}^{3J}$, nuclei coordinates $X = (X^1, \ldots, X^N) \in \mathbf{R}^{3N}$, and a Hamiltonian operator $H(x,X)$

$$H(x,X) = V(x,X) - \frac{1}{2}M^{-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\Delta_{X^n}. \tag{1.2}$$

The nuclei masses M are assumed to be large and the interaction potential V, independent of M, is in the canonical setting (neglecting relativistic and magnetic effect),

$$\begin{aligned} V(x,X) = \quad & -\tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{J}\Delta_{x^j} + \sum_{1\le k<j\le J}\frac{1}{|x^k - x^j|} \\ & - \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}\frac{Z_n}{|x^j - X^n|} + \sum_{1\le n<m\le N}\frac{Z_n Z_m}{|X^n - X^m|}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

composed of the kinetic energy of the electrons, the electron-electron repulsion, the electron-nuclei attraction, and the repulsion of nuclei (with charge Z_n), in the Hartree atomic units where the electron mass, electron charge, reduced Planck constant, and the Coulomb force constant $(4\pi\epsilon_0)^{-1}$ all are one. The mass of the nuclei, which are much greater than one (electron mass), are the diagonal elements in the diagonal matrix M.

An essential feature of the partial differential equation (1.1) is the high computational complexity to determine the solution, in an antisymmetric/symmetric subset of the Sobolev space $H^1(\mathbf{R}^{3(J+N)})$. Wave functions depend also on discrete spin states

$$\Phi(x^1, \sigma_1, \ldots, x^J, \sigma_J, X_1, \Sigma_1, \ldots, X_N, \Sigma_N), \tag{1.4}$$

which effect the solutions space: each electron spin σ_j can take two different values and each nucleus can be in a finite set of spin states Σ_n; the *Pauli exclusion principle* restricts the solutions space to wave functions satisfying the antisymmetry/symmetry

$$\Phi(\ldots, x^j, \sigma_j, \ldots, x^k, \sigma_k, \ldots) = -\Phi(\ldots, x^k, \sigma_k, \ldots, x^j, \sigma_j, \ldots) \text{ for any } 1 \le j, k \le J$$

and for any pair of nuclei n and m, with A nucleons and the same number of protons and neutrons,

$$\Phi(\ldots, X^m, \Sigma_m, \ldots, X^n, \sigma_n, \ldots) = (-1)^A\Phi(\ldots, X^n, \Sigma_n, \ldots, X^m, \Sigma_m, \ldots)$$

cf. [10]. We simplify the notation by writing $\Phi(x,X)$ instead of the more complete (1.4), since the Hamiltonian H does not depend on the spin. The time-independent Schrödinger equation has convincing agreement with experimental results, as the basis for computational chemistry and solid state physics. An attractive property of the Schrödinger equation (1.1) is the precise definition of the Hamiltonian and the solutions space, without unknown parameters. The agreement with measurements can be further improved by including relativistic and magnetic effects, cf. [10].

In contrast to the Schrödinger equation, a *molecular dynamics* model of nuclei $X : [0,T] \to \mathbf{R}^{3N}$, with a given potential $V_p : \mathbf{R}^{3N} \to \mathbf{R}$, can be computationally studied also for large N by solving the ordinary differential equation

$$M\ddot{X}_\tau = -\partial_X V_p(X_\tau). \tag{1.5}$$

This computational and conceptual simplification motivates the study to determine the potential and its implied accuracy by a derivation of molecular dynamics from the Schrödinger equation, as started already in the 1920's with the seminal Born-Oppenheimer approximation [6]. The purpose here is to contribute to the

current understanding of such derivations, by showing convergence rates under new assumptions. The precise aim in this paper is to estimate the error

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N+3J}} g(X)\Phi(x,X)^*\Phi(x,X)dxdX - \lim_{T\to\infty} T^{-1}\int_0^T g(X_\tau)d\tau \tag{1.6}$$

of a given position observable $\int g(X)\Phi(x,X)^*\Phi(x,X)dxdX$ of the time-indepedent Schrödinger equation (1.1) approximated by the corresponding molecular dynamics observable $\lim_{T\to\infty} T^{-1}\int_0^T g(X_\tau)d\tau$, which is computationally cheaper to evaluate for several nuclei.

A useful sub step to derive molecular dynamics from the Schrödinger equation is *Ehrenfest dynamics*, for classical *ab initio* motion of the nuclei coupled to Schrödinger dynamics for the electrons,

$$\begin{array}{ll} M\ddot{X}_\tau^n & = -\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}} \phi_\tau^*(x,X_\tau)\,\partial_{X^n} V(x,X_\tau)\,\phi_\tau(x,X_\tau)\;dx \\ i\dot{\phi}_\tau & = V(\cdot,X_\tau)\phi_\tau, \end{array} \tag{1.7}$$

with the initial normalization $\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}} \phi_0^*(x,X_0)\phi_0(x,X_0)dx = 1$. The Ehrenfest dynamics (1.7) has been derived from the time-dependent Schrödinger equation through the self consistent field equations, see [7, 40, 51]. Equation (1.7) can be used for *ab initio* computation of molecular dynamics, cf. [40, 37]. A next step is the zero-order Born-Oppenheimer approximation, where X_τ solves the classical *ab initio* molecular dynamics (1.5) with the potential $V_p : \mathbf{R}^{3N} \to \mathbf{R}$ determined as an eigenvalue of the electron Hamiltonian $V(\cdot,X)$ for a given nuclei position X, that is $V_p = \lambda_0$ and $V(\cdot,X)\psi_0(\cdot,X) = \lambda_0(X)\psi_0(\cdot,X)$ for an electron eigenfunction $\psi_0(\cdot,X) \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^{3J})$, for instance the ground state.

The Born-Oppenheimer expansion [6] is an approximation of the solution to the time-independent Schrödinger equation which is shown [27, 32] to solve the time-independent Schrödinger equation approximately. This expansion, analyzed by the methods of multiple scales, pseudo differential operators and spectral analysis in [27, 32, 19], can be used to study the approximation error (1.6), cf. Section 2.4.1. Although in the literature it seems easier to find precise statements on the error in observables for the other setting of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. Instead of an asymptotic expansion, we use a different method based on a Hamiltonian dynamics formulation of the time-independent Schrödinger eigenfunction and the stability of the corresponding perturbed Hamilton-Jacobi equations viewed as a hitting problem. Another motivation for our method is that it forms a sub step in trying to estimate the approximation error using only information available in molecular dynamics simulations.

The related problem of approximating observables to the time-dependent Schrödinger by the Born Oppenheimer expansions is well studied, theoretically [8, 43] and computationally [35] using the Egorov theorem. The Egorov theorem shows that finite time observables of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation are approximated with $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ accuracy by the zero-order Born-Oppenheimer dynamics, with an electron eigenvalue gap. In the special case of a position observable and no electrons (i.e. V=V(X) in (1.2)), the Egorov theorem states that

$$\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X)\Phi(X,t)^*\Phi(X,t)\,dX - \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X_t)\Phi(X_0,0)^*\Phi(X_0,0)\,dX_0\Big| \leq C_t M^{-1}, \tag{1.8}$$

where $\Phi(X,t)$ is a solution to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation $iM^{-1/2}\partial_t\Phi(\cdot,t) = H\Phi(\cdot,t)$ with the Hamiltonian (1.2) and the path X_t is the nuclei coordinates for the dynamics with the Hamiltonian $|\dot{X}|^2/2 + V(X)$. If the initial wave function $\Phi(X,0)$ is the eigenfunction in (1.1) the first term in (1.8) reduces to the first term in (1.6) and the second terms can also become the same in an ergodic limit; however since we do not know that the parameter C_t (bounding an integral over $(0,t)$) is bounded for all time we cannot directly conclude an estimate for (1.6) from (1.8). In this perspective, to study the time-independent instead of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation has the important differences that

- the infinite time study of the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics can be reduced to a finite time hitting problem,

- the computational and theoretical problem of specifying initial data for the Schrödinger equation is avoided, and
- computational cheap evaluation of a position observable $g(X)$ is possible using the time average $\lim_{T\to\infty} \int_0^T g(X_\tau)d\tau/T$ along the solution path X_τ.

This paper derives the Ehrenfest dynamics (1.7) and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation from the time-independent Schrödinger equation (1.1) and establishes convergence rates for molecular dynamics approximations to time-independent Schrödinger observables under simple assumptions excluding so called *caustic* points, where the Jacobian determinant $\det \partial X_t/\partial X_0$ of the Eulerian-Lagrangian transformation of $X-$paths vanish. As mentioned, the main new analysis idea is to write the time-independent Schrödinger equation (1.1) as a Hamiltonian system and analyze the approximations by comparing their Hamiltonians with the Schrödinger Hamiltonian, using the theory of Hamilton-Jacobi partial differential equations; the problematic infinite time evolution of perturbations in the dynamics is solved by viewing it as a finite time hitting problem for the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Another difference is we analyze the transport equation as a time-dependent Schrödinger equation in contrast to the traditional rigorous and formal asymptotic expansions.

The main inspiration for this paper is [42, 4, 5] and the semi-classical WKB analysis in [41]: the work [42, 4, 5] derives the time-dependent Schrödinger dynamics of an $x-$system, $i\dot{\Psi} = H_1\Psi$, from the time-independent Schrödinger equation (with the Hamiltonian $H_1(x) + \delta H(x, X)$) by a classical limit for the environment variable X, as the coupling parameter δ vanishes and the mass M tends to infinity; in particular [42, 4, 5] show that the time derivative enters through the coupling of Ψ with the classical velocity. Here we refine the use of characteristics to study classical *ab initio* molecular dynamics, where the coupling does not vanish, and we establish error estimates for Born-Oppenheimer, Ehrenfest, surface-hopping and stochastic approximations of the Schrödinger observables in the case of no caustics present. The small scale, introduced by the perturbation

$$-(2M)^{-1}\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}$$

of the potential V, is identified in a modified WKB eikonal equation and analyzed trough the corresponding transport equation as a time-dependent Schrödinger equation along the eikonal characteristics. This modified WKB formulation reduces to the standard semi-classical approximation, cf. [41], for the case of a potential function $V(X) \in \mathbf{R}$ (depending only on nuclei coordinates) but becomes different in the case of operator valued potentials studied here. The global analysis of WKB functions started by Maslov in the 1960' [41] and lead to the subject Geometry of Quantization, relating global classical paths to eigenfunctions of the Schrödinger equation, cf. [14]. The analysis here, based on a Hamiltonian system interpretation of the time-independent Schrödinger equation and stability of the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi equation, bypasses the usual separation of nuclei and electron wave functions in the time-dependent self consistent field equations [7, 40, 51].

Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 show that observables based on a *single WKB Schrödinger eigenstate* are approximated by observables from the Ehrenfest dynamics and the zero-order Born-Oppenheimer dynamics with error $\mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha})$, using that these approximate solutions generate approximate eigenstates to the Schrödinger equation: in the case of no caustics and the electron eigenvalues satisfying a spectral gap condition, there holds $\alpha = 1-\delta$ for any $\delta > 0$; for non degenerate electron eigenvalue crossings the convergence rate is reduced to $\alpha = 1/2 - \delta$ for Born-Oppenheimer dynamics and $\alpha = 3/4$ for Ehrenfest dynamics, using the stationary phase method in Section 7.4. The results are based on the Hamiltonian (1.2) with any potential V that is smooth in X, e.g. a regularized version of the Coulomb potential (1.3). The derivation does not assume that the nuclei are supported on small domains; in contrast, derivations based on the time-dependent self consistent field equations require nuclei to be supported on small domains. The reason that small support is not needed here comes from the combination of the characteristics and sampling from an equilibrium density, that is, the nuclei paths behave classically although they may not be supported on small domains, in the case of no caustics. Section 5 shows that caustics couple the WKB modes, as is well known from geometric optics,

see [31, 41], and generate non orthogonal WKB modes that are coupled in the Schrödinger density; otherwise, without caustics the Schrödinger density is asymptotically decoupled into a simple sum of individual WKB densities. Remark 6.3 relates the approximation results to the accuracy of symplectic numerical methods for molecular dynamics.

Section 3 shows that the Ehrenfest dynamics is formally the same when derived from the time-independent and time-dependent Schrödinger equations; a unique property of the time-independent Schrödinger equation we use is the interpretation of its dynamics $X_t \in \mathbf{R}^{3N}$ returning to a co-dimension one surface I and thereby reducing the dynamics to a hitting time problem with finite time excursions from I. Another advantage with molecular dynamics approximating an eigenvalue, is that stochastic perturbations of the electron ground state can be interpreted as a Gibbs distribution of degenerate nuclei-electron eigenstates of the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem (1.1). The time-independent eigenvalue setting also avoids the issue on "wave function collapse" to an eigenstate, present in the time-dependent Schrödinger equation.

The model (1.5) simulates dynamics at constant energy $M|\dot{X}|^2/2 + V_p(X)$, constant number of particles N and constant volume, i.e. the microcanonical ensemble. The alternative to simulate with constant number of particles, constant volume and constant *temperature* T, i.e. the canonical ensemble, is possible for instance with the stochastic *Langevin dynamics*

$$\begin{aligned} dX_\tau &= v_\tau d\tau \\ M dv_\tau &= -\partial_X V_p(X_t) d\tau - K v_t d\tau + (2TK)^{1/2} dW_\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

where W_τ is the standard Brownian process (at time τ) in $\mathbf{R}^{3N}$ with independent components and K is a positive friction parameter. When the observable only depends on the nuclei positions, i.e. not on the nuclei velocities or the correlation of positions at different times, the *Smoluchowski dynamics*

$$dX_\tau = -\partial_X V_p(X_\tau) + (2T)^{1/2} dW_\tau \tag{1.10}$$

is a simplified alternative to Langevin dynamics, cf. [9].

Section 7.2 shows that the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem can be written as a Hamiltonian molecular dynamics system and that the equilibrium Gibbs distribution of the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian system approximates the Gibbs distribution of the Hamiltonian Schrödinger dynamics with accuracy $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ for a spectral gap case. Theorem 8.3 shows that Langevin and Smoluchowski dynamics accurately approximate observables of Schrödinger and Ehrenfest Gibbs equilibrium dynamics, when the observable depends only on the nuclei positions but not their correlation at different time. The derivation uses a classical equilibrium Gibbs distribution, based on a probability distribution to be in any WKB eigenstate (corresponding to a degenerate eigenvalue of the Schrödinger equation (1.1)), randomly perturbed from the electron ground state; the derivation uses an other assumption of a spectral gap and no caustics. The main idea in the theorem is the formulation of a *classical* Gibbs equilibrium distribution of eigenstates, motivated by nuclei acting as heat bath for the electrons in the *quantum* Ehrenfest and Schrödinger Hamiltonian systems. Theorem 8.5 shows that stochastic perturbations of the ground state can also generate a temperature dependent contribution to the drift, depending on a spectral gap of the electron eigenvalues.

I hope that these ideas can be further developed to better understand molecular dynamics simulations, for instance

- I assume that the electron eigenfunction ψ_0 is smooth enough as a function of X, which holds when the potential V is smooth in X – to find a possibly reduced convergence rate in the Coulomb case (1.3) will require a more careful study,
- it would be desirable to understand the effect of caustics, as it is for systems without electrons (or with electrons as heavy as the nuclei) in the so called semi-classical limit, cf. [41].

We use the notation $\psi(x, X) = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha})$ also for complex valued functions, meaning that $|\psi(x, X)| = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha})$ holds uniformly in x and X.

2. Ehrenfest dynamics derived from the time-independent Schrödinger equation

2.1. **Exact Schrödinger dynamics.** Assume for simplicity that all nuclei have the same mass.[1] The singular perturbation $-(2M)^{-1}\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}$ of the potential V introduces an additional small scale $M^{-1/2}$ of high frequency oscillations, as shown by a WKB-expansion, see [45, 29, 28, 13]. We will construct solutions to (1.1) in such WKB-form

$$\Phi(x,X) = \psi(x,X)e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}, \tag{2.1}$$

where the wave function ψ is complex valued, the phase θ is real valued and the factor $M^{1/2}$ is introduced to have well defined limits of ψ and θ as $M\to\infty$. The standard WKB-construction [41, 28] is based on a series expansion in powers of $M^{1/2}$ which solves the Schrödinger equation with arbitrary high accuracy. We introduce instead of an asymptotic solution an actual solution based on a time-dependent Schrödinger transport equation. This transport equation reduces to the formulation in [41] for the case of a potential function $V(X)\in\mathbf{R}$ (depending only on nuclei coordinates $X\in\mathbf{R}^{3N}$) and modifies it for the case of a self-adjoint potential operator $V(\cdot,X)$ on the electron space $L^2(\mathbf{R}^{3J})$ focused on here; the second difference is that we analyze the transport equation as a time-dependent Schrödinger equation instead of as an asymptotic expansion. In the next section we use a linear combination of such eigensolutions. The WKB-solution satisfies the Schrödinger equation (1.1) provided that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (H-E)\psi e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)} \\ &= \Big((\tfrac{|\partial_X\theta|^2}{2} + V - E)\psi \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{2M}\textstyle\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi - \tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\sum_j(\partial_{X^j}\psi\partial_{X^j}\theta + \tfrac{1}{2}\psi\partial_{X^jX^j}\theta)\Big)e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

We will see that only eigensolutions Φ that correspond to dynamics without caustics correspond to such a single WKB-mode, as for instance when the eigenvalue E is inside an electron eigenvalue gap. Introduce the complex-valued scalar product

$$v\cdot w := \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}} v(x,\cdot)^* w(x,\cdot)dx \equiv \langle v|w\rangle$$

on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^{3J})$ and the notation $X\bullet Y$ for the standard scalar product on R^{3N}. To find an equation for θ, multiply (2.2) by $\psi^* e^{-iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}$ and integrate over $\mathbf{R}^{3J}$; similarly take the complex conjugate of (2.2), multiply by $\psi e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}$ and integrate over $\mathbf{R}^{3J}$; and finally add the two expressions to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 2\big(\tfrac{|\partial_X\theta|^2}{2} - E\big)\ \psi\cdot\psi + \underbrace{\psi\cdot V\psi + V\psi\cdot\psi}_{=2\psi\cdot V\psi} \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{2M}\Big(\psi\cdot(\textstyle\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi) + (\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi)\cdot\psi\Big) \\ &\quad -\tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\Big(\underbrace{\psi\cdot(\partial_X\psi\bullet\partial_X\theta) - (\partial_X\psi\bullet\partial_X\theta)\cdot\psi}_{=2i\Im\left(\psi\cdot(\partial_X\psi\bullet\partial_X\theta)\right)}\Big) \\ &\quad +\tfrac{i}{2M^{1/2}}\Big(\underbrace{(\psi\cdot\psi - \psi\cdot\psi)}_{=0}\textstyle\sum_j \partial_{X^jX^j}\theta\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

The purpose of the phase function θ is to generate an accurate approximation in the limit as $M\to\infty$: therefore we define θ by the formal limit of (2.3) as $M\to\infty$, which is the *Hamilton-Jacobi equation* (also called the *eikonal equation*)

$$\tfrac{|\partial_X\theta|^2}{2} = E - V_0, \tag{2.4}$$

[1] If this is not the case, change to new coordinates $M_1^{1/2}\tilde{X}^k = M_k^{1/2}X^k$, which transform the Hamiltonian to the form we want $V(x, M_1^{1/2}M^{-1/2}\tilde{X}) - (2M_1)^{-1}\sum_{n=1}^N \Delta_{\tilde{X}^n}$.

where the function $V_0 : \mathbf{R}^{3N} \to \mathbf{R}$ is

$$V_0 := \frac{\psi \cdot V\psi}{\psi \cdot \psi}.$$

This Eikonal equation (2.4) reduces to the standard formulation

$$(\frac{|\partial_X \theta|^2}{2} - E + V)\psi = 0, \tag{2.5}$$

cf. [41], when the potential function $V(X) \in \mathbf{R}$ depends only on nuclei coordinates $X \in \mathbf{R}^{3N}$ but (2.4) is different for the case with an operator valued self-adjoint potential $V(\cdot, X)$ on the electron space $L^2(\mathbf{R}^{3J})$; in particular the standard condition (2.5) requires ψ to be an eigenfunction of V. The reason we use the Eikonal equation (2.4) instead of (2.5) is that the corresponding transport equation to leading order becomes a variant of the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian dynamics (1.7), as shown in the remainder of this section. This section is also a step towards the more basic construction in Section 7.2, were we modify V_0 in (7.7) with an asymptotically negligible term, to write the time-independent Schödinger equation as a Hamiltonian system, so that the combination of the Eikonal equation and the corresponding transport equation forms a Hamiltonian system.

For the energy E chosen larger than the potential energy, that is such that $E \geq V_0$, the method of *characteristics*, cf. [18],

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{dX_t}{dt} & = \partial_X \theta(X_t) =: p_t, \\ \frac{dp_t}{dt} & = -\partial_X V_0(X_t), \\ \frac{dz_t}{dt} & = |p_t|^2 = 2\big(E - V_0(X_t)\big), \end{array} \tag{2.6}$$

yields a solution $(X, p, z) : [0, T] \to U \times \mathbf{R}^{3N} \times \mathbf{R}$ to the eikonal equation (2.4) locally in a neighborhood $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{3N}$, for regular compatible data (X_0, p_0, z_0) given on a $3N-1$ dimensional "inflow"-domain $I \subset \overline{U}$; here $z_t := \theta(X_t)$. Typically the domain I and the data $\theta|_I$ are not given, unless it is really an inflow domain and characteristic paths do not return to I as in a scattering problem. If paths leaving from I return to I, there is an additional compatibility of data on I: we have $z_0 = -\int_0^t |p^s|^2 ds + z_t$, where $X_0 \in I$ and $X_t \in I$, so that $z_t = \theta(X_t)$ and $p_t = \partial_X \theta(X_t)$ are determined from $z_0 = \theta(X_0)$ and $p_0 = \partial_X \theta(X_0)$, and continuing the path to subsequent hitting points $X_{t_j} \in I,\ j = 1, 2, \ldots$ determines $\big(\theta(X_{t_j}), \partial_X \theta(X_{t_j})\big)$ from $\big(\theta(X_0), \partial_X \theta(X_0)\big)$. Our derivation of approximation error will use such a WKB Ansatz for the approximate Ehrenfest solution, the Born-Oppenheimer solution and for the exact Schrödinger solution Φ. As we shall see, the Ehrenfest and Born-Oppenheimer approximations have related (simpler) equations for its characteristics.

The phase function $\theta : U \to \mathbf{R}$ becomes globally defined in $U \subset \mathbf{R}^{3N}$ when there is a unique characteristic path X_t going through each point in U. A globally defined wave function Φ can be constructed from a linear combination of WKB functions also when caustics are present, using the manifold of phase-space solutions (X, p) and Fourier integral operators to relate X and p dependence, see [41] and [14]. We assume in this work that characteristics do not collide to avoid multi valued solutions. A simple case without caustics is when the potential is such that $\min_{X \in \mathbf{R}}(E - V_0(X)) > 0$, in one dimension. Section 4.1 presents approximations with a linear combination of WKB functions related to so called surface-hopping.

Definition (2.4) and equation (2.2) imply that ψ solves the so called *transport equation*

$$-\frac{1}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi + (V - V_0)\psi = \frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\sum_j \big(\partial_{X^j}\psi \partial_{X^j}\theta + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{X^j X^j}\theta\psi\big). \tag{2.7}$$

Time enters into the Schrödinger equation through the characteristics and the chain rule

$$\partial_X \psi \bullet \partial_X \theta = \partial_X \psi \bullet \frac{dX_t}{dt} = \frac{d\psi(x, X_t)}{dt},$$

cf. [42, 4, 5]. The second term in the right hand side of (2.7) can be simplified by the scalar integrating factor

$$G_t := e^{\tilde{G}_t}, \tag{2.8}$$

defined along the characteristics from

$$\frac{d\tilde{G}_t}{dt} := \frac{1}{2}\sum_j \partial_{X^j X^j}\theta(X_t). \tag{2.9}$$

The integrating factor G_t, defined by (2.8) and (2.9), gives

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\sum_j \left(\partial_{X^j}\psi\partial_{X^j}\theta + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{X^j X^j}\theta\psi\right) &= \tfrac{d\psi}{dt} + \tfrac{\psi}{G_t}\tfrac{dG_t}{dt}\\ &= \tfrac{1}{G_t}\tfrac{d(G_t\psi)}{dt}.\end{aligned}$$

We can also define a function $G : \mathbf{R}^{3N} \to \mathbf{R}$ by identifying $G(X_t) := G_t$. This step, with the integrating factor G, differs from [42, 4, 5], which approximates the last term in (2.7),

$$\sum_j \partial_{X^j X^j}\theta\psi,$$

by zero in their case of vanishing coupling between the quantum system and the environment; here the coupling between the nuclei and electrons does not vanish. The right hand side in (2.7) becomes the time derivative $iM^{-1/2}G^{-1}\ d(G\psi)/dt$ and we have derived the *time-dependent Schrödinger* equation, for the variable $\tilde{\psi} := G\psi$,

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= (H-E)\Phi\\ &= \Big(\big(-\tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\tilde{\psi}} + (V-V_0)\tilde{\psi} - \tfrac{1}{2M}\textstyle\sum_j G\Delta_{X^j}(\tilde{\psi}G^{-1})\big)G^{-1}\\ &\quad + \underbrace{\big(\frac{|\partial_X\theta|^2}{2} + V_0 - E\big)\ \psi}_{=0}\Big)e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

The density can be written

$$\rho := \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}} |\psi|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}} |\tilde{\psi}|^2 dx/G^2 \tag{2.11}$$

and therefore the second equation in (2.6) yields the nuclei dynamics

$$\ddot{X} = -\partial_X \frac{\tilde{\psi}\cdot V\tilde{\psi}}{\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}}.$$

The weight function G_t^2 equals the determinant of the first variation $\partial X_t/\partial X_0$ modulo a constant

$$G_t^2/G_0^2 = \det(\partial X_t/\partial X_0), \tag{2.12}$$

which follows from Liouville's formula, see [41], and in one dimension $G_t^2/G_0^2 = p_t/p_0$.

In conclusion, we have rewritten a WKB solution of the time-independent Schrödinger equation in the form of the exact *Schrödinger dynamics* along the characteristics of the Eikonal equation and the transport equation

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\tilde{\psi}} = (V-V_0)\tilde{\psi} - \tfrac{1}{2M}\textstyle\sum_j G\Delta_{X^j}(\tilde{\psi}/G),\\ &\ddot{X} = -\partial_X \tfrac{\tilde{\psi}\cdot V\tilde{\psi}}{\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

The eigenvalue E is a parameter in the Hamiltonian for the characteristics of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.4). In the case when no electrons are present, we have $V = V_0$, and equation (2.13) was derived from (1.1-1.2) and (2.1) in [41]. The integrating factor G and its derivative $\partial_X G$ can be determined from $(p, \partial_X p, \partial_{XX} p)$

along the characteristics by the following characteristic equations obtained from X-differentiation of (2.4)

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{dt}\partial_{X^r}p^k &= \Big[\textstyle\sum_j p^j\partial_{X^jX^r}p^k = \sum_j p^j\partial_{X^rX^k}p^j\Big]\\
&= -\textstyle\sum_j \partial_{X^r}p^j\partial_{X^k}p^j - \partial_{X^rX^k}V_0,\\
\tfrac{d}{dt}\partial_{X^rX^q}p^k &= \Big[\textstyle\sum_j p^j\partial_{X^jX^rX^q}p^k = \sum_j p^j\partial_{X^rX^kX^q}p^j\Big]\\
&= -\textstyle\sum_j \partial_{X^r}p^j\partial_{X^kX^q}p^j - \sum_j \partial_{X^rX^q}p^j\partial_{X^k}p^j - \partial_{X^rX^kX^q}V_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

and similarly $\partial_{XX}G$ can be determined from $(p, \partial_X p, \partial_{XX}p, \partial_{XXX}p)$.

2.2. **Approximate Ehrenfest dynamics and densities.** We define the approximating *Ehrenfest dynamics* by in (2.2) neglecting the term $(2M)^{-1}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi$:

$$0 = \Big(\tfrac{|\partial_X\hat\theta|^2}{2} + V - E\Big)\check\psi - \tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\textstyle\sum_j(\partial_{X^j}\check\psi\partial_{X^j}\hat\theta + \frac{1}{2}\check\psi\partial_{X^jX^j}\hat\theta), \tag{2.15}$$

and seek, as in (2.4), the approximate phase $\hat\theta$ as the solution to eikonal equation

$$\frac{|\partial_X\hat\theta|^2}{2} = E - \hat V_0, \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$\hat V_0 := \frac{\check\psi\cdot V\check\psi}{\check\psi\cdot\check\psi}.$$

Introduce its characteristics

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d\hat X_t}{dt} &= \partial_X\hat\theta(X_t) =: \hat p_t,\\
\tfrac{d\hat p_t}{dt} &= -\partial_X\hat V_0(\hat X_t),\\
\tfrac{d\hat z_t}{dt} &= |\hat p_t|^2 = 2\big(E - \hat V_0(\hat X_t)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

to rewrite (2.15), as in (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= -\big(\tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\hat\psi} - (V-\hat V_0)\hat\psi\big)\hat G^{-1} + \underbrace{\big(\frac{|\partial_X\hat\theta|^2}{2} + \hat V_0 - E\big)}_{=0}\check\psi,\\
\ddot{\hat X} &= -\partial_X\Big(\tfrac{\hat\psi\cdot V\hat\psi}{\hat\psi\cdot\hat\psi}\Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

for $\hat\psi := \hat G\check\psi$ approximating $\tilde\psi$ and

$$\hat G_t := Ce^{\int_0^t 2^{-1}\sum_j \partial_{X^j}\hat p_s^j ds} \tag{2.18}$$

as in (2.9) (where C is a positive constant for each characteristic). Using that $\hat\psi\cdot\hat\psi$ is conserved (i.e. time-independent) in the Ehrenfest dynamics, we can normalize to $\hat\psi\cdot\hat\psi = 1$. Note that in the exact dynamics, the function $\tilde\psi\cdot\tilde\psi$ is not conserved, due to the $L^2(\mathbf{R}^{3J})$ non symmetric source term $\frac{1}{2M}\sum_j G\Delta_{X^j}(\tilde\psi/G)$ in (2.13). We have

$$V_0 = \frac{\psi\cdot V\psi}{\psi\cdot\psi} = \frac{\tilde\psi\cdot V\tilde\psi}{\tilde\psi\cdot\tilde\psi} \tag{2.19}$$

and

$$\hat V_0 = \frac{\hat\psi\cdot V\hat\psi}{\hat\psi\cdot\hat\psi} = \hat\psi\cdot V\hat\psi.$$

2.3. **Comparison of two alternative Ehrenfest formulations.** The two different Ehrenfest dynamics (2.17) respectively (1.7) differ in:

(1) the different time scales t (slow) respectively $M^{1/2}t =: \tau$ (fast);
(2) the potentials $V - \hat{V}_0$ and V in the equations for $\hat{\psi}$ and ϕ, respectively; and
(3) the forces $\partial_X(\hat{\psi}\cdot V\hat{\psi})$ respectively $\phi\cdot\partial_X V\phi$ in the momentum equation.

If $\hat{\psi}$ solves (2.17), the change of variables

$$\hat{\phi} = \hat{\psi} e^{-iM^{1/2}\int_0^t \hat{\psi}\cdot V\hat{\psi}(X_s)ds}$$

and the property $\hat{\psi}\cdot A\hat{\psi} = \hat{\phi}\cdot A\hat{\phi}$, which holds for observables A not including the nuclei momentum $i\partial_X$ (in particular for $A = V$), imply that $\hat{\phi}$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\hat{\phi}} &= V\hat{\phi}, \\ \ddot{X} &= -\partial_X\left(\tfrac{\hat{\phi}\cdot V\hat{\phi}}{\hat{\phi}\cdot\hat{\phi}}\right) = \partial_X(\hat{\phi}\cdot V\hat{\phi}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

There has been a discussion in the literature [7, 51] whether the forces should be computed as above in (2.20) or as in (1.7) by

$$\begin{aligned} M\ddot{X}^n_\tau &= -\textstyle\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}} \phi^*(\cdot, X_\tau)\,\partial_{X^n} V(\cdot, X_\tau)\,\phi(\cdot, X_\tau)\,dx \\ i\dot{\phi}_\tau &= V(\cdot, X_\tau)\phi_\tau. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 below show that both formulations (2.20) and (2.21, 1.7) yield accurate approximations of the Schrödinger observables, although they are not the same and (2.21, 1.7) is closer to the Schrödinger observables: the reason that both approximations are accurate is that (2.21, 1.7) forms a Hamiltonian system (as explained below and in Section 6) which is close the Hamiltonian system for the Schrödinger equation, see Theorem 6.1, while the formulation (2.20) can be viewed as a Hamiltonian system approximating the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics (1.5), using that the wave function $\check{\varphi}$ is close to an electron eigenfunction (see Section 7.4), and the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics approximates Schrödinger observables, see Theorem 6.2.

The formulation (1.7) and (2.21) has the advantage to be a closed Hamiltonian system: the variable $(X, \varphi_r; p, \varphi_i)$, with the definition

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &:= \varphi_r + i\varphi_i := 2^{1/2}M^{-1/4}\phi = 2^{1/2}M^{-1/4}(\phi_r + i\phi_i), \\ \partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta} &=: \varphi_i, \end{aligned}$$

and the *Ansatz* $\tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta}$ imply that the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H_E &:= \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_X\tilde{\theta}\bullet\partial_X\tilde{\theta} + \phi_r\cdot V(X)\phi_r + \phi_i\cdot V(X)\phi_i \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_X\tilde{\theta}\bullet\partial_X\tilde{\theta} + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\varphi_r\cdot V(X)\varphi_r + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\varphi_i\cdot V(X)\varphi_i \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_X\tilde{\theta}\bullet\partial_X\tilde{\theta} + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\varphi_r\cdot V(X)\varphi_r + 2^{-1}M^{1/2}\partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta}\cdot V(X)\partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta} \\ &= E, \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where the derivative $\partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta}(X, \varphi_r) = \varphi_i$, of the functional $\tilde{\theta} : \mathbf{R}^{3N}\times L^2(dx) \to \mathbf{R}$, is the Gateaux derivative in $L^2(dx)$. Its characteristics form the Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}_t &= p_t \\ \dot{p}_t &= -\tfrac{M^{1/2}}{2}\varphi(t)\cdot\partial_X V(X_t)\varphi(t) \\ \dot{\varphi}_r(t) &= M^{1/2}V(X_t)\varphi_i(t) \\ \dot{\varphi}_i(t) &= -M^{1/2}V(X_t)\varphi_r(t), \end{aligned}$$

which is the same as the *Hamiltonian system* (2.21)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \dot{X}_t & = p_t \\ \dot{p}_t & = -\phi_t \cdot \partial_X V(X_t)\phi_t \\ \frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\phi}_t & = V(X_t)\phi_t. \end{array} \tag{2.23}$$

The Hamiltonian system yields the equation for the phase

$$\dot{\tilde{\theta}} = \partial_X \tilde{\theta} \bullet \dot{X} + \partial_{\varphi_r}\tilde{\theta}\cdot\dot{\varphi}_r = p \bullet p + 2\phi_i \cdot V\phi_i = 2(E - \phi_r \cdot V\phi_r),$$

since $\tilde{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}(X, \varphi_r)$ is a function of both X and φ_r in this formulation. The important property of this Hamiltonian dynamics is that $(X, p, \hat{\psi})$, with

$$\hat{\psi} = \phi e^{iM^{1/2}\int_0^t \phi\cdot V\phi(s)ds},$$

solves both the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.16) and (2.15), which leads to an approximate solution of the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem in (6.1)-(6.3).

The alternative (2.20) does not form a closed system, in the sense that the required function $\partial_X\psi(X_t)$ is not explicitly determined along the characteristics, but can be obtained from values of ψ, in a neighborhood of X_t, by differentiation.

2.4. **Equations for the density.** We note that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \psi & = \left(\frac{\rho}{\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}}\right)^{1/2}\tilde{\psi}, \\ \check{\psi} & = \left(\frac{\hat{\rho}}{\hat{\psi}\cdot\hat{\psi}}\right)^{1/2}\hat{\psi}, \end{array}$$

shows that the densities $\rho = \psi\cdot\psi$ (defined in (2.11)) and $\hat{\rho} := \check{\psi}\cdot\check{\psi}$, in addition to $(X, p, \tilde{\psi})$ and $(\hat{X}, \hat{p}, \hat{\psi})$, are needed to determine the wave functions ψ and $\check{\psi}$.

Equation (2.2) and the projections in (2.3) subtracted (instead of added) imply that the density ρ satisfies

$$\begin{array}{ll} -M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi\cdot\Delta_{X^j}\psi) & = \sum_j \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}}(\partial_{X^j}\psi^*\psi + \psi^*\partial_{X^j}\psi)dx\ \partial_{X^j}\theta + \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3J}}\psi^*\psi dx\ \partial_{X^jX^j}\theta \\ & = \sum_j \partial_{X^j}(\rho\partial_{X^j}\theta), \end{array}$$

where $\Im w$ denotes the imaginary part of w, and consequently, the density can be determined along a characteristic using (2.9) and (2.14)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \dot{\rho}(X_t) & = \sum_j \partial_{X^j}\rho(X_t)\dot{X}^j \\ & = \sum_j \partial_{X^j}\rho(X_t)\partial_{\hat{X}^j}\theta \\ & = -\rho(X_t)\sum_j \partial_{X^jX^j}\theta - M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi\cdot\Delta_{X^j}\psi) \\ & = -\rho(X_t)\ \mathrm{div} - M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi\cdot\Delta_{X^j}\psi)\, p \\ & = -\rho(X_t)\frac{d}{dt}\log G_t^2 - M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi\cdot\Delta_{X^j}\psi). \end{array} \tag{2.24}$$

Similarly, the Ehrenfest density satisfies the conservation of mass

$$0 = \sum_j \partial_{\hat{X}^j}(\hat{\rho}\partial_{\hat{X}^j}\hat{\theta})$$

so that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \dot{\hat{\rho}}(\hat{X}_t) & = \sum_j \partial_{\hat{X}^j}\hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t)\dot{\hat{X}}^j \\ & = -\hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t)\frac{d}{dt}\log\hat{G}_t^2 \end{array} \tag{2.25}$$

with the solution

$$\hat{\rho}(\hat{X}_t) = \frac{C}{\hat{G}_t^2}, \tag{2.26}$$

where C is a positive constant for each characteristic. Note that the derivation of this classical density does not need a corresponding WKB equation but uses only the conservation of mass that holds for classical paths. The classical density corresponds precisely to the Eulerian-Lagrangian change of coordinates $\hat{G}_t^2/\hat{G}_0^2 = \det(\partial \hat{X}_t/\partial \hat{X}_0)$ in (2.12). Different characteristic paths $\hat{X}$ may have different densities when a path does not visit the whole configuration space $\mathbf{R}^{3N}$. The density from the Schrödinger equation is therefore important to weight different paths.

2.4.1. *The $\rho - \hat{\rho}$ error without electrons.* Comparing (2.24) and (2.25), the difference $\rho - \hat{\rho}$ has contributions both from $G - \hat{G}$ and from the error term $M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi \cdot \Delta_{X^j}\psi)$. In this section we show heuristically how the characteristics can be used to estimate the difference $\rho - \hat{\rho}$, leading to $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ accurate Ehrenfest approximations of Schrödinger observables

$$\int g(X) \underbrace{\rho(X)}_{\Phi\cdot\Phi} dX = \int g(X)\hat{\rho}(X)dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}),$$

in the well known case of no electrons present; Section 7.4 extends this derivation to the case including electrons.

In the special case of no electrons, the X dynamics does not depend on $\tilde{\psi}$ and therefore $\hat{X} = X$ and consequently $\hat{G} = G$. The difference $\tilde{\psi} - \hat{\psi}$ can be understood from iterative approximations of (2.13)

$$\frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\psi}_{n+1} - (V - \hat{V}_0)\hat{\psi}_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2M} G \sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(G^{-1}\hat{\psi}_n) \tag{2.27}$$

with $\hat{\psi}_0 = 0$. Then $\hat{\psi}_1 = \hat{\psi}$ is the Ehrenfest approximation and formally we have the iterations approaching the full Schrödinger solution $\hat{\psi}_n \to \tilde{\psi}$ as $n \to \infty$.

In the special case of no electrons, there holds $V = \hat{V}_0$, so the transport equation $i\dot{\hat{\psi}}_1 = 0$ has constant solutions; let $\hat{\psi}_1 = 1$. Then $\hat{\psi}_2 - \hat{\psi}_1$ is imaginary with its absolute value bounded by $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$; write the iterations of $\hat{\psi}_n$ by integrating (2.27) as the linear mapping

$$\hat{\psi}_{n+1} = 1 + iM^{-1/2}S(\hat{\psi}_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} i^k M^{-k/2} S^k(\hat{\psi}_1)$$

which formally shows that

$$|\tilde{\psi}|^2 = |\hat{\psi}_1|^2 + 2\Re\big((\tilde{\psi} - \hat{\psi}_1)\cdot\hat{\psi}_1\big) + |\tilde{\psi} - \hat{\psi}_1|^2 = 1 + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}).$$

Consequently this special Ehrenfest density satisfies

$$\hat{\rho} = \hat{G}^{-2} = \underbrace{G^{-2}\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}}_{=\rho} + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}), \tag{2.28}$$

since $\hat{G} = G$ and X do not depend on $\tilde{\psi}$. In the general case with electrons, we show in Section 7.4 that there is a solution $\tilde{\psi}$ which is $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ close in $L^2(dx)$ to an electron eigenfunction ψ_0, satisfying

$$V(X,\cdot)\psi_0(X,\cdot) = \lambda_0(X)\psi_0(X,\cdot)$$

for an eigenvalue $\lambda_0(X) \in \mathbf{R}$ and (fixed) nuclei position X. The state $\hat{\psi}_1$ equal to a constant, in the case of no electrons, corresponds to the electron eigenfunction ψ_0 in the case with electrons present. In the general case with electrons, Section 7.4 shows that still

$$\tilde{\psi} - \hat{\psi} = i\alpha + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) \tag{2.29}$$

where $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ is real and parallel to ψ_0, which implies that the Hamiltonians H_S and H_E are are $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ close so also $G - \hat{G} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ and consequently the density bound (2.28) holds. To obtain the

estimate (2.29) the important new property is that oscillatory cancellation is used in directions orthogonal to ψ_0, reducing the error terms from $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ to $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$, in the case when a spectral gap condition holds.

2.5. **Construction of the solution operator.** The WKB-forms (2.1) and (2.15) are meaningful when ψ and $\check{\psi}$ do not include the full small scale and we verify in Section 7 that both $\partial_X\psi$ and $\partial_X\check{\psi}$ are bounded independent of M, in the case of a spectral gap. Section 7 also presents conditions so that $\tilde{\psi}$ is $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ close to an eigenvector of V in $L^2(dx)$. To replace $\tilde{\psi}$ by such an electron eigenstate is called the *Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, which has been studied for the time-independent [50, 6] and the time-dependent [26, 44] Schrödinger equations by different methods.

To construct the solution operator it is convenient to include a non interacting particle, i.e. a particle without charge, in the system and assume that this particle moves with constant high speed $dX_1^1/dt = p_1^1 \gg 1$ (or equivalently with speed one and larger mass); such a non interacting particle does clearly not effect the other particles. The additional new coordinate X_1^1 is helpful in order to simply relate the time-coordinate t and X_1^1. To not change the original problem (1.1), add the corresponding kinetic energy $(p_1^1)^2/2$ to E and write equation (2.10) in the fast time scale $\tau = M^{1/2}t$

$$i\frac{d}{d\tau}\tilde{\psi} = (V - V_0)\tilde{\psi} - \frac{1}{2M}G\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(G^{-1}\tilde{\psi})$$

and change to the coordinates

$$(\tau, X_0) := (\tau, X_2^1, X_3^1, X^2, \ldots, X^N) \in [0,\infty)\times I \text{ instead of } (X^1, X^2, \ldots, X^N) \in \mathbf{R}^{3N},$$

where $X^j = (X_1^j, X_2^j, X_3^j) \in \mathbf{R}^3$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{\tilde{\psi}} + \tfrac{1}{2(p_1^1)^2}\ddot{\tilde{\psi}} &= (V - V_0)\tilde{\psi} - \tfrac{1}{2M}G\textstyle\sum_j \Delta_{X_0^j}(G^{-1}\tilde{\psi}) \\ &=: \tilde{V}\tilde{\psi}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

using the notation $\dot{w} = dw/d\tau$ in this section; note also that G is independent of X_1^1. We see that the operator

$$\bar{V} := G^{-1}\tilde{V}G = \underbrace{G^{-1}(V - V_0)G}_{=V-V_0} - \frac{1}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X_0^j}$$

is symmetric on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^{3J+3N-1})$. The solution of the eikonal equation (2.4), by the characteristics (2.6), becomes well defined in a domain $U = [0, M^{1/2}t]\times\mathbf{R}^{3N-1}$, in the new coordinates. Assume now the data (X_0, p_0, z_0) for $X_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{3N-1}$ is $(L\mathbb{Z})^{3N-1}$-periodic, then also (X_τ, p_τ, z_τ) is $(L\mathbb{Z})^{3N-1}$-periodic. To simplify the notation for such periodic functions, define the periodic circle

$$\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{R}/(L\mathbb{Z}).$$

We seek a solution Φ of (1.1) which is $(L\mathbb{Z})^{3(J+N)-1}$-periodic in the (x, X_0)-variable. The Schrödinger operator $\bar{V}_\tau$ has, for each τ, real eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m(\tau)\}$ with a complete set of eigenvectors $\{p_m(x, X_0)_\tau\}$ orthogonal in the space of x-anti-symmetric functions in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3J+3N-1})$, see [3]; its proof uses that the operator $\bar{V}_\tau + \gamma I$ generates a compact solution operator in the Hilbert space of x-anti-symmetric functions in $L^2(\mathbb{T}^{3J+3N-1})$, for the constant $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$ chosen sufficiently large. The discrete spectrum and the compactness comes from Fredholm theory for compact operators and that the bilinear form $\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v\bar{V}_\tau w + \gamma vw\, dxdX_0$ is continuous and coercive on $H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$, see [18] and Section 9. We see that $\tilde{V}$ has the same eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m(\tau)\}$ and the eigenvectors $\{G_\tau p_m(\tau)\}$, orthogonal in the weighted L^2-scalar product

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3N-1}} v\cdot w\; G^{-2}dX_0.$$

The construction and analysis of the solution operator continues in Sections 7 and 9 based on the spectrum.

Remark 2.1 (Boundary conditions)**.** The eigenvalue problem (1.1) makes sense not only in the periodic setting but also with alternative boundary conditions from interaction with an external environment, e.g. for scattering problems. The inflow, with data given from the time-independent Schrödinger problem, and the outflow of characteristics gives a different perspective on molecular dynamics simulations and the possible initial data for the time-dependent Schrödinger equation.

3. The time-dependent Schrödinger equation

The corresponding time-dependent *Ansatz*

$$\psi(x,X,t)e^{iM^{1/2}\left(\theta(X,t)+Et\right)}$$

in the time-dependent Schrödinger equation [48]

$$\frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\dot{\Phi} = H\Phi \tag{3.1}$$

leads analogously to the equations

$$\begin{array}{ll} \partial_t\theta + \frac{|\partial_X\theta|^2}{2} & = E - V_0, \\ \partial_t\rho + \sum_j \partial_{X^j}(\rho\partial_{X^j}\theta) & = M^{-1/2}\sum_j \Im(\psi\cdot\Delta_{X^j}\psi), \end{array}$$

coupled to the Schrödinger equation along its characteristics X_t

$$\begin{array}{l} \frac{i}{M^{1/2}}\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\psi}(x,X_t,t) = (V-V_0)\tilde{\psi} - \frac{G}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\tilde{\psi}G^{-1}), \\ \ddot{X} = -\frac{\partial_X(\tilde{\psi}\cdot V\tilde{\psi})}{\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}}, \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

with the same equation for $(X, p, \tilde{\psi}, \rho, z, \partial_X p, \partial_{XX} p)$ as for the characteristics (2.4) and (2.13) in the time-independent formulation. The Ehrenfest dynamics is therefore the same when derived from the time-dependent and time-independent Schrödinger equations and the additional coordinate, introduced by a non interacting particle in the construction of the time-independent solution in Section 2.5, can be interpreted as time. A difference is that the time variable is given from the time-dependent Schrödinger equation and implies classical velocity, instead of the other way around for the time-independent formulation.

4. Surface-hopping and multiple states

In general the eigenvalue E is degenerate with high multiplicity related to that several combinations of kinetic nuclei energy and potential energy sum to E

$$-\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)}} \Phi^* \frac{1}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\Phi dxdX + \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)}} \Phi^* V\Phi dxdX = E\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)}} \Phi^*\Phi dxdX,$$

with different excitations of kinetic nuclei energy and Born-Oppenheimer electronic eigenstates. When several such states are excited, it is useful to consider a linear combination of eigenfunctions $\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \psi_n e^{iM^{1/2}\theta_n} =: \bar{\Phi}$, where the individual terms solve (1.1) for the same energy E. We have

$$H\bar{\Phi} = E\bar{\Phi} \tag{4.1}$$

and the normalization $\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \|\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$ implies $\|\bar{\Phi}\|_{L^2} = 1$. Such a solution $\bar{\Phi}$ can be interpreted as an exact *surface-hopping* model. The usual surface-hopping models make a somewhat different *Ansatz* with the x-dependence of ψ_n prescribed from a given orthonormal basis in $L(\mathbf{T}^{3J})$ of wave functions of different energy and with explicit time-dependence, see [51, 50]. This section extends the Ehrenfest dynamics to multiple states.

4.1. **Surface-hopping and Ehrenfest dynamics for multiple states.** The characteristic (X_n, p_n), the wave function $\tilde{\psi}_n$, the density ρ_n and the phase $z_n(t) = \theta_n\big(X_n(t)\big)$ determine the time-independent wave function ψ_n and the corresponding Ehrenfest approximation

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \hat{\psi}_n (r_n \hat{\rho}_n)^{1/2} e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{z}_n} \quad =: \hat{\Phi} \tag{4.2}$$

yields an approximation to $\bar{\Phi}$; the density of state n is now a constant multiple, $r_n \geq 0$, of the one-state density $\hat{\rho}_n$ defined in (2.26), normalized to $\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)}} \hat{\rho}_n dX = 1$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} r_n = 1$. In the case of no caustics, the Ehrenfest states $(\hat{X}_n, \hat{\psi}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$, $n = 1, \ldots, \bar{n}$, satisfying (2.17) and (2.26), are asymptotically uncoupled, see Section 5; a caustic point a is where $1/\hat{\rho}_n(a) = 0$. In the case of caustics and $\bar{n}$ colliding characteristics, the phases become coupled and it is necessary to have a sum of $\bar{n}$ WKB terms for $\hat{\Phi}$ to approximate the eigenfunction Φ, in (1.1), away from caustic points, see [31, 41]. Consequently in the presence of caustics, surface-hopping approximation may improve poor approximation by Ehrenfest dynamics.

5. Computation of observables

Assume the goal is to compute a real-valued *observable*

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX$$

for a given bounded linear multiplication operator $A = A(X)$ on $L^2(\mathbf{T}^{3N})$ and a solution $\bar{\Phi}$ of (4.1). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX &= \textstyle\sum_{n,m} \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} A(\psi_n e^{iM^{1/2}\theta_n}) \cdot \psi_m e^{iM^{1/2}\theta_m} dX \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{n,m} \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} A e^{iM^{1/2}(\theta_m - \theta_n)} (\psi_n \cdot \psi_m) dX. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

The integrand is oscillatory for $n \neq m$, so that critical points of the phase difference give the main contribution: the method of stationary phase (cf. [14, 41] and Section 7.5) shows that these integrals are small, bounded by $\mathcal{O}(M^{-3N/4})$, in the case when the phase difference has non degenerate critical points (or no critical point) and the functions $A\psi_n \cdot \psi_m$, θ_n are sufficiently smooth. A critical point a satisfies $\partial_X \theta_n(a) - \partial_X \theta_m(a) = 0$, which means that the two different paths, generated by θ_n and θ_m, through a also have the same velocity p in this point. Consequently the critical point must be a caustic point since otherwise the paths are the same. That the critical point is non degenerate means that the matrix $\partial_{XX}(\theta_n - \theta_m)(a)$ is non singular.

We see that WKB terms, with smooth phases and coefficients avoiding caustics, are asymptotically orthogonal, so that the density of a linear combination of them, separates asymptotically to a sum of densities of the individual WKB terms:

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX = \sum_{n=1}^{\bar{n}} \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} A \underbrace{\psi_n \cdot \psi_n}_{=\rho_n r_n} dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}), \tag{5.2}$$

in the case of multiple eigenstates, $\bar{n} > 1$, and

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} \bar{\Phi} \cdot A \bar{\Phi} dX = \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} A \, \psi_1 \cdot \psi_1 dX$$

for a single eigenstate. We will study molecular dynamics approximations of a single state

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} A \, \psi_n \cdot \psi_n dX = \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} A(X) \rho_n(X) dX. \tag{5.3}$$

in the next section.

In the presence of a caustic, the WKB terms can be asymptotically non orthogonal, since their coefficients and phases typically are not smooth enough to allow the integration by parts to gain powers of $M^{-1/2}$. Non orthogonal WKB functions tells how the caustic couples the WKB modes.

To numerically compute the integral (5.3) requires to find an approximation $\hat{\rho}_n$ of ρ_n, using the Ehrenfest solution $(\hat{X}_n, \hat{\psi}_n)$, and to replace the integrals by quadrature (with a finite number of points X). The

quadrature approximation is straight forward in theory, although costly in practical computations. Regarding the inflow density $\hat{\rho}_n\big|_I$ there are two situations - either the characteristics return often to the inflow domain or not. If they do not return we have a scattering problem and it is reasonable to define the inflow-density $\hat{\rho}_n\big|_I$ as an initial condition. If characteristics return, the dynamics can be used to estimate the return-density $\hat{\rho}_n\big|_I$ as follows: assume that the following limits exist

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{T}\int_0^T A(\hat{X}_t)dt \quad = \int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} A(\hat{X})\hat{\rho}_n(\hat{X})d\hat{X} \tag{5.4}$$

which bypasses the need to find $\hat{\rho}_n\big|_I$ and the quadrature in the number of characteristics. A way to think about this limit is to sample the return points $\hat{X}_t \in I$ and from these samples construct an *empirical* return-density, converging to $\hat{\rho}_n\big|_I$ as the number of return iterations tends to infinity. We shall use this perspective to view the Eikonal equation (2.16) as a hitting problem on I, with hitting times τ (i.e. return times). We allow the density $\hat{\rho}|_I$ to depend on the initial position $\hat{X}_0$; the more restrictive property to have $\hat{\rho}|_I$ constant as a function of $\hat{X}_0$ is called *ergodicity*.

6. Approximation of a deterministic WKB state by Hamiltonian dynamics

A numerical computation of an approximation to $\sum_n \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} \psi_n \cdot A\psi_n dX$ has the main ingredients:

(1) to approximate the exact characteristics by Ehrenfest characteristics (2.17),
(2) to discretize the Ehrenfest characteristics equations, and either
(3) if $\rho\big|_I$ is an inflow-density, to introduce quadrature in the number of characteristics, or
(4) if $\rho\big|_I$ is a return-density, to replace the ensemble average by a time average using the property (5.4).

This section presents a derivation of the approximation error in step one, in the case of a return density, avoiding the second, third and fourth discretization steps studied for instance in [9, 10, 36].

6.1. **The Ehrenfest approximation error.** This section shows that the Ehrenfest system, written as a Hamiltonian system (1.7), approximates Schrödinger observables without caustics. We see that the approximate wave function $\hat{\Phi}$ defined by

$$\hat{\Phi} = \hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi}e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \ , \tag{6.1}$$

where $\hat{\psi} = \hat{\phi}e^{iM^{1/2}\int_0^t \hat{\phi}\cdot V\hat{\phi}(s)ds}$ and $(\hat{X}, \hat{\phi})$ solves the Hamiltonian system (2.21) or the system (2.20), is an approximate solution to the Schrödinger equation (1.1)

$$(H-E)\hat{\Phi} = -\frac{1}{2M}e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi}), \tag{6.2}$$

since by (2.2), (2.13), (2.15) and (2.17)

$$\begin{aligned}(H-E)\hat{\Phi} \quad &= -\underbrace{\big(iM^{-1/2}\dot{\hat{\psi}} - (V-\hat{V}_0)\hat{\psi}\big)}_{=0}\hat{\rho}^{1/2}e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\big(\frac{|\partial_X\hat{\theta}|^2}{2} + \hat{\psi}\cdot V\hat{\psi} - E\big)}_{=0}\hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi}e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}} \\ &\quad -\tfrac{e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}}}{2M}\textstyle\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi}) \\ &= -\tfrac{1}{2M}e^{iM^{1/2}\hat{\theta}}\textstyle\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}(\hat{\rho}^{1/2}\hat{\psi}).\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Therefore $\hat{\Phi}$ approximates a single WKB eigenstate Φ, satisfying $H\Phi = E\Phi$. The following theorem presents conditions for accurate approximation error of observables

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} g(X)\ \underbrace{\Phi\cdot\Phi}_{=\rho(X)}\,dX - \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} g(X)\,\underbrace{\hat{\Phi}\cdot\hat{\Phi}}_{=\hat{\rho}(X)}\,dX,$$

using that either the spectral gap condition (6.4) *or* the crossing eigenvalue condition (6.5) holds, based on the electron eigenvalues λ_n, defined by $V(X)\psi_n(X) = \lambda_n(X)\psi_n(X)$ in $L^2(dx)$.

The spectral gap condition. The electron eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n\}$ satisfy for some positive c the spectral gap condition

$$\inf_{n\neq 0,\ Y\in D} |\lambda_n(Y) - \lambda_0(Y)| > c, \tag{6.4}$$

where $D := \{X_t \ : \ t \geq 0\} \cup \{\hat{X}_t \ : \ t \geq 0\}$ is the set of exact and approximate nuclei positions.

The crossing eigenvalue condition. Assume that there is a positive constant c such that the sets of eigenvalue number $n \neq 0$ and eigenvalue crossing times σ, with maximal hitting times τ (defined in (7.11)),

$$\begin{array}{ll} \Omega_X & = \{(n,\sigma) \ : \ \lambda_n(X_\sigma) = \lambda_0(X_\sigma), \quad 0 \leq \sigma \leq \tau, n \neq 0\} \\ \Omega_{\hat{X}} & = \{(n,\sigma) \ : \ \lambda_n(\hat{X}_\sigma) = \lambda_0(\hat{X}_\sigma), \quad 0 \leq \sigma \leq \tau, n \neq 0\} \end{array} \tag{6.5}$$

consists of finite many crossing times σ with precisely one n value for each crossing time (but possibly different n at different crossing times) and

$$\begin{array}{l} |\frac{d}{dt}\big(\lambda_n(X_t) - \lambda_0(X_t)\big)|_{(n,t)\in\Omega_X} > c \\ |\frac{d}{dt}\big(\lambda_n(\hat{X}_t) - \lambda_0(\hat{X}_t)\big)|_{(n,t)\in\Omega_{\hat{X}}} > c. \end{array}$$

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that the electron eigenvalues have a spectral gap* (6.4) *and* $\alpha = 1 - \delta$*, or that they form non degenerate critical points* (6.5) *and* $\alpha = 3/4$*, then Ehrenfest dynamics* (2.23)*, assumed to avoid caustics and have bounded hitting times* τ *in* (7.11)*, approximates time-independent Schrödinger observables with the error bounded by* $\mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha})$ *:*

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} g(\hat{X})\hat{\rho}(\hat{X})d\hat{X} \ = \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} g(X)\rho(X)dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}), \text{ for any } \delta > 0. \tag{6.6}$$

The proof is in Section 7, with the main steps separated into six subsections: spectral decomposition, Schrödinger eigenvalues as a Hamiltonian system, stability from perturbed Hamiltonians, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, the stationary phase method, and error estimates of the densities. The observable may include the time variable, through the position of a non interacting (non-charged) nucleus moving with given velocity, so that transport properties as e.g. the diffusion and viscosity of a liquid may by determined, cf. [23]. A case with no caustics is e.g. when $\min_X(E - V_0(X)) > 0$ in one dimension $X \in \mathbf{R}$.

6.2. **The Born-Oppenheimer approximation error.** The Born-Oppenheimer approximation leads to the standard formulation of *ab initio* molecular dynamics, in the micro-canonical ensemble with constant number of particles, volume and energy, for the nuclei positions $\bar{X}$,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \dot{\bar{X}}_t & = \bar{p}_t \\ \dot{\bar{p}}_t & = -\partial_X \lambda_0(\bar{X}_t) \end{array} \tag{6.7}$$

by using that the electrons are in the eigenstate ψ_0 with eigenvalue λ_0 to V, in $L^2(dx)$ for fixed X. The corresponding Hamiltonian is $H_{BO}(\bar{X},\bar{p}) := |p|^2/2 + \lambda_0(X)$. The following theorem shows that Born-Oppenheimer dynamics approximates Schrödinger observables, based on a single WKB eigenstate, as accurate as the Ehrenfest dynamics, using the approximate Schrödinger solution

$$\hat{\Phi} = \bar{G}^{-1}\psi_0 e^{iM^{1/2}\bar{\theta}_0},$$

with density $\bar{\rho} := \hat{\Phi}\cdot\hat{\Phi}$ and $\bar{G}$ defined by $d\log\bar{G}/dt = \mathrm{div}\bar{p}/2$, as for G in (2.9)

Theorem 6.2. *Assume that the electron eigenvalues have a spectral gap* (6.4) *and* $\alpha = 1$*, or that they form non degenerate critical points* (6.5) *and* $\alpha = 1/2$*, then the zero-order Born-Oppenheimer dynamics* (6.7)*, assumed to avoid caustics and bounded hitting times* τ *in* (7.11)*, approximates time-independent Schrödinger observables with error bounded by* $\mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha+\delta})$ *:*

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} g(\bar{X})\bar{\rho}(\bar{X})d\bar{X} \ = \int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N}} g(X)\rho(X)dX + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha+\delta}), \text{ for any } \delta > 0. \tag{6.8}$$

The proof is in Section 7.

Remark 6.3 (Why do symplectic numerical simulations of molecular dynamics work?)**.** The derivation of the approximation error for the Ehrenfest and Born-Oppenheimer dynamics, in Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, also allows to study perturbed systems. For instance, the perturbed Born-Oppenheimer dynamics

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{X} &= p + \partial_p H^\delta(X,p,\hat{\psi})\\ \dot{p} &= -\partial_X \lambda_0(X) - \partial_X H^\delta(X,p,\hat{\psi}),\end{aligned}$$

generated from a perturbed Hamiltonian $H_{BO}(X,p,\hat{\psi}) + H^\delta(X,p,\hat{\psi}) = E$, with the perturbation satisfying

$$\|H^\delta\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta \quad \text{for some } \delta \in (0,\infty) \tag{6.9}$$

yields through (7.13) and (7.16) an additional error term $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ to the approximation of observables in (6.6). So called symplectic numerical methods are precisely those that can be written as perturbed Hamiltonian systems, see [46], and consequently we have a method to precisely analyze their numerical error by combining an explicit construction of H^δ with the stability condition (6.9) to obtain $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1}+\delta)$ accurate approximations. The popular Störmer-Verlet method is symplectic and the positions X coincides with those of the symplectic Euler method, for which H^δ is explicitly constructed in [46] with δ proportional to the time step.

7. Analysis of the molecular dynamics approximation

This section continues the construction of the solution operator started in Section 2.5. It is written for the Schrödinger characteristics, but it can be directly applied to the Ehrenfest case by replacing $\tilde{V}$ by $V - \hat{V}_0$ (by formally taking the limit $M \to \infty$ in the term $(2M)^{-1} G \sum_j \Delta X_j (G^{-1}\tilde{\psi})$). Assume for a moment that $\tilde{V}$ is independent of τ. Then the solution to (2.30) can be written as a linear combination of the two exponentials

$$Ae^{i\tau\alpha_+} + Be^{i\tau\alpha_-}$$

where the two characteristic roots are

$$\alpha_\pm = (p_1^1)^2\big(-1 \pm (1 - 2(p_1^1)^{-2}\tilde{V})^{1/2}\big).$$

We see that $e^{i\tau\alpha_-}$ is a highly oscillatory solution on the fast τ-scale with

$$\alpha_- = -2(p_1^1)^2 + \tilde{V} + \mathcal{O}\big(\tilde{V}^2/(p_1^1)^2\big),$$

while

$$\alpha_+ = -\tilde{V} + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{V}^2/(p_1^1)^2). \tag{7.1}$$

Therefore we chose initial data

$$i\dot{\tilde{\psi}}|_{\tau=0} = -\alpha_+\tilde{\psi}|_{\tau=0} \tag{7.2}$$

to have $B = 0$, which eliminates the fast scale, and the limit $p_1^1 \to \infty$ determines the solution by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\dot{\tilde{\psi}} = \tilde{V}\tilde{\psi}.$$

In the case of the Ehrenfest dynamics, this equation with $\tilde{V}$ replaced by $V - \hat{V}_0$ is the starting point. The next section presents an analogous construction for the slowly, in τ, varying operator $\tilde{V}$.

7.1. **Spectral decomposition.** Write (2.30) as the first order system

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{\tilde\psi} &= v \\ \dot v &= 2(p_1^1)^2 i(\tilde V\tilde\psi - v) \end{aligned}$$

which for $\bar\psi := (\tilde\psi, v)$ takes the form

$$\dot{\bar\psi} = iA\bar\psi \quad A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 2(p_1^1)^2\tilde V & -2(p_1^1)^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm$, right eigenvectors $q_\pm$ and left eigenvectors $q_\pm^{-1}$ of the real "matrix" operator A are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\pm &:= (p_1^1)^2\Big(-1 \pm \big(1 - 2(p_1^1)^{-2}\tilde V\big)^{1/2}\Big), \\ q_+ &:= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\lambda_+ \end{pmatrix}, \\ q_- &:= \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_-^{-1} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ q_+^{-1} &:= \tfrac{1}{1-\lambda_+/\lambda_-}\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \lambda_-^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \\ q_-^{-1} &:= \tfrac{1}{1-\lambda_+/\lambda_-}\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_+ \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We see that $\lambda_+ = -\tilde V + \mathcal{O}\big((p_1^1)^{-2}\big)$ and $\lambda_- = -2(p_1^1)^2 + \tilde V + \mathcal{O}\big((p_1^1)^{-2}\big)$. The important property here is that the left eigenvector limit $\lim_{p_1^1\to\infty} q_+^{-1} = (1,0)$ is constant, independent of τ, which implies that the q_+ component $q_+^{-1}\bar\psi = \tilde\psi$ decouples: we obtain in the limit $p_1^1 \to \infty$ the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{\tilde\psi}(\tau) &= i\tfrac{d}{d\tau}(q_+^{-1}\bar\psi_\tau) \\ &= iq_+^{-1}\tfrac{d}{d\tau}\bar\psi_\tau \\ &= -q_+^{-1}A_\tau\bar\psi_\tau \\ &= -\lambda_+(\tau)q_+^{-1}\bar\psi_\tau \\ &= -\lambda_+(\tau)\tilde\psi(\tau) \\ &= \tilde V_\tau\tilde\psi(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where the operator $\tilde V_\tau$ depends on τ and (x, X_0), and we define the solution operator S

$$\tilde\psi(\tau) = S_{\tau,0}\tilde\psi(0). \tag{7.3}$$

As in (7.2) we can view this as choosing special initial data for $\tilde\psi(0)$; from now on we only consider such data.

The operator $\tilde V$ can be symmetrized

$$\bar V_\tau := G_\tau^{-1}\tilde V_\tau G_\tau = (V - V_0)_\tau - \frac{1}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X_0^j}, \tag{7.4}$$

with real eigenvalues $\{\check\lambda_m\}$ and orthonormal eigenvectors $\{p_m\}$ in $L^2(dxdX_0)$, satisfying

$$\bar V_\tau p_m(\tau) = \check\lambda_m(\tau)p_m(\tau),$$

see Section 9. Therefore $\tilde V_\tau$ has the same eigenvalues and the eigenvectors $\bar p_m := G_\tau p_m$, which establishes the spectral representation

$$\tilde V_\tau\tilde\psi(\cdot,\tau,\cdot) = \sum_m \check\lambda_m(\tau)\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N-1}}\tilde\psi(\cdot,0,\cdot)\cdot\bar p_m G_\tau^{-2}dX_0\ \bar p_m(\tau), \tag{7.5}$$

where the scalar product is

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3N-1}} \tilde{\psi} \cdot \bar{p}_m G_\tau^{-2} dX_0. \tag{7.6}$$

We note that the weight G^{-2} on the co-dimension one surface $\mathbf{T}^{3N-1}$ appears precisely because the operator $\tilde{V}$ is symmetrized by G and the weight G^{-2} corresponds to the Eulerian-Lagrangian change of coordinates (2.12). The existence of the orthonormal set of eigenvectors and real eigenvalues makes the operator $\tilde{V}$ essentially self-adjoint in the Lagrangian coordinates and hence the solution operator S becomes unitary in the Lagrangian coordinates. In the case of the Ehrenfest dynamics the weight is the density $\hat{\rho} = G^{-2}$;

7.2. **Schrödinger eigenvalues as a Hamiltonian system.** Our error analysis is based on comparing perturbations of Hamiltonian systems. This section establishes the Schrödinger eigenvalue characteristics as a Hamiltonian system, analogously to the Hamiltonian system (2.23) for Ehrenfest dynamics.

To write the Schrödinger eigenvalue characteristics as a Hamiltonian system requires to make an asymptotically negligible change in the definition of V_0 in (2.10): the Eikonal equation used the leading order term $V_0 = \tilde{\psi} \cdot V\tilde{\psi}/\tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}$. An alternative choice is to replace V by the complete Schrödinger operator

$$\check{V}\tilde{\psi} := V\tilde{\psi} - G(2M)^{-1} \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(\tilde{\psi} G^{-1})$$

and symmetrize

$$V_0 := \frac{\tilde{\psi} \cdot \check{V}\tilde{\psi} + \check{V}\tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}}{2 \int \tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}\, G^{-2} dX / \int G^{-2} dX}. \tag{7.7}$$

The integral in X is used in the denominator to avoid the non constant $\tilde{\psi} \cdot \tilde{\psi}$; since $\check{V}$ is essentially self-adjoint in the weighted space $L^2(G^{-2}dX)$ in (7.6), corresponding to Lagrangian coordinates, the weighted L^2 norm in the denominator is constant in time and consequently the denominator can be treated as a constant when differentiating the Hamiltonian to obtain the Hamiltonian system.

This definition of V_0 has the same leading order term as the previous (2.19). Equation (2.10) showed that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (H - E)\Phi \\ &= \Big(\big(- \tfrac{i}{M^{1/2}} \dot{\tilde{\psi}} + (V - V_0)\tilde{\psi} - \tfrac{1}{2M} \textstyle\sum_j G \Delta_{X^j}(\tilde{\psi} G^{-1}) \big) G^{-1} \\ &\quad + \big(\tfrac{|\partial_X \theta|^2}{2} + V_0 - E \big) \tilde{\psi} \Big) e^{iM^{1/2}\theta(X)}, \end{aligned}$$

for any definition of the scalar V_0, which we now use for the new V_0. Note that, it is only when $(V - V_0)\tilde{\psi}$ is small that we expect the X-derivative of $\tilde{\psi}$ to be bounded, since otherwise the $e^{iM^{1/2}\theta}$ scale will pollute derivatives: $p \cdot \partial_X \tilde{\psi} = -iM^{1/2}(\check{V} - V_0)\tilde{\psi}$. Therefore, the interesting case is when $\tilde{\psi}$ is close to an electron eigenfunction and V_0 is near the corresponding eigenvalue.

The goal here is to show that the Eikonal equation, corresponding to the second term above, becomes a Hamiltonian system for the value function $\theta(X, p, \varphi)$, so that it also generates the Schrödinger equation in the first term above, analogously to the Ehrenfest dynamics (2.23). Define $\varphi = 2M^{1/4}\phi$ and the Hamiltonian

$$H_S(X, p, \varphi) := \frac{|p|^2}{2} + \frac{\phi \cdot \check{V}\phi + \check{V}\phi \cdot \phi}{2}, \tag{7.8}$$

similar as in (2.23), which yields the Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X} &= p \\ \dot{p} &= -\tfrac{\phi \cdot \partial_X \check{V}\phi + \partial_X \check{V}\phi \cdot \phi}{2} \\ i\dot{\phi} &= M^{1/2}\check{V}\phi \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

using that $\check{V}$ is symmetric in the weighted scalar product $L^2(dxG^{-2}dX)$, see (7.4). The phase factor change $\tilde{\psi} := \phi e^{iM^{1/2}\int_0^t (\phi\cdot\check{V}\phi+\check{V}\phi\cdot\phi)/(2\int\phi\cdot\phi\, G^{-2}dX/\int G^{-2}dX)ds}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{X} &= p\\ \dot{p} &= -\frac{\tilde{\psi}\cdot\partial_X\check{V}\tilde{\psi}+\partial_X\check{V}\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}}{2\int\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi}\, G^{-2}dX/\int G^{-2}dX}\\ i\dot{\tilde{\psi}} &= M^{1/2}\underbrace{(\check{V}-V_0)}_{=:\tilde{V}}\tilde{\psi}\end{aligned}$$

for V_0 defined by (7.7) and

$$|\partial_X\theta|^2/2 + V_0 = E.$$

The last two equations imply that $(X, p, \tilde{\psi})$ and the weight G, defined by (2.9) (using the new V_0), generate a WKB function $\Phi := G^{-1}\tilde{\psi}e^{iM^{1/2}\theta}$ that solves the Schrödinger equation $H\Phi = E\Phi$ in (1.1). Therefore, the Hamiltonian (7.8) generates an exact solution to the Schrödinger equation.

7.3. **Stability from perturbed Hamiltonians.** This section derives error estimates of the weight functions G when the corresponding Hamiltonian system is perturbed.

To derive the stability estimate we consider the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$H(\partial_Y\theta(Y), Y) = 0$$

in an optimal control perspective, with the corresponding Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{Y}_t &= \partial_q H(q_t, Y_t)\\ \dot{q}_t &= -\partial_Y H(q_t, Y_t).\end{aligned}$$

Define the "value" function

$$\theta(Y_0) = \theta(Y_t) - \int_0^t h(q_s, Y_s)ds$$

where the "cost" function defined by

$$h(q, Y) := q \bullet \partial_q H(q, Y) - H(q, Y)$$

satisfies the Pontryagin principle (related to the Legendre transform)

$$H(q, Y) = \sup_Q \big(q \bullet \partial_Q H(Q, Y) - h(Q, Y)\big). \tag{7.10}$$

Let $\theta\Big|_I$ be defined by the hitting problem

$$\theta(Y_0) = \theta(Y_\tau) - \int_0^\tau h(q_s, Y_s)ds$$

using the hitting time τ on the return surface I

$$\tau := \inf\{t \ : \ Y_t \in I \ \&\ t > 0\}. \tag{7.11}$$

Define analogously for a perturbed Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$, the dynamics $(\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{q}_t)$, the value function $\tilde{\theta}$ and the cost function $\tilde{h}$.

We can think of the difference $\theta - \tilde{\theta}$ as composed by perturbation of the boundary data (on the return surface I) and perturbations of the Hamiltonians. The difference of the value functions due to the perturbed Hamiltonian satisfy the stability estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(Y_0) - \tilde{\theta}(Y_0) &\geq \theta(\tilde{Y}_{\tilde{\tau}}) - \tilde{\theta}(\tilde{Y}_{\tilde{\tau}}) + \textstyle\int_0^{\tilde{\tau}} (H - \tilde{H})\big(\partial_Y\theta(\tilde{Y}_t), \tilde{Y}_t\big)dt\\ \theta(Y_0) - \tilde{\theta}(Y_0) &\leq \theta(Y_\tau) - \tilde{\theta}(Y_\tau) + \textstyle\int_0^{\tau} (H - \tilde{H})\big(\partial_Y\tilde{\theta}(Y_t), Y_t\big)dt\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

with a difference of the Hamiltonians evaluated along the same solution path. This result follows by differentiating the value function along a path and using the Hamilton-Jacobi equations, see Remark 7.1 and [12].

Assume that

$$\sup_{(q,Y)=(\partial_Y\tilde\theta(Y_t),Y_t),\ (q,Y)=(\partial_Y\theta(\tilde Y_t),\tilde Y_t)} |(H-\tilde H)(q,Y)| = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}). \tag{7.13}$$

The stability estimate, for all characteristic paths and following subsequent hitting points on I (as in the discussion after (2.6)), then yields the same estimate of the difference in the boundary data

$$\|\theta-\tilde\theta\|_{L^\infty(I)} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha})$$

provided the maximal hitting time τ is bounded, which we assume. If the return surface is the plane for which the X_1 particle has its first component equal to its initial value, the hitting time is the time it takes until this particle has the first component equal to that initial value again; since the X-dynamics does not explicitly depend on M it seems reasonable that one can find a return surface such that the hitting times are bounded. Next, the representation can be applied to interior points to obtain

$$\|\theta-\tilde\theta\|_{L^\infty} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}).$$

When the value functions θ and $\tilde\theta$ are smoothly differentiable in X (X is a part of the Y coordinate) with derivatives bounded uniformly in M, the stability estimate (7.12) implies that also the difference of the second derivatives has the bound

$$\|\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\theta - \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\tilde\theta\|_{L^\infty} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha+\delta}),\ \text{for any } \delta>0.$$

We will also use that

$$M^{-1/2}\Im(\psi\cdot\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\psi)/(\psi\cdot\psi) = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}) \tag{7.14}$$

which is verified in Section 7.4.4.

Our goal is to analyze the density function ρ satisfying the convection equation (2.9), i.e.

$$\partial_X\theta\bullet\partial_X\log\rho = -\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\theta + d \tag{7.15}$$

where the function $d = d_{BO}, d = d_E$ or $d = d_S$ with

$$d_{BO} = d_E = 0$$
$$d_S = -M^{-1/2}\Im(\psi\cdot\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\psi)/(\psi\cdot\psi)$$

in the case of Born-Oppenheimer, Ehrenfest or Schrödinger dynamics, respectively. We have $\partial_X\theta\bullet\partial_X\log\rho = d\log\rho(X_t)/dt$ and we interpret equation (7.15) as a Hamilton-Jacobi equation and similarly for $\log\tilde\rho$. Then the stability of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, as in (7.12), can be applied to (7.15), with the Hamiltonian

$$H_\rho(\partial_X\log\rho, X) := \partial_X\theta(X)\bullet\partial_X\log\rho(X) + \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\theta(X) - d,$$

to obtain the sought error estimate

$$\|\log\rho - \log\tilde\rho\|_{L^\infty} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha+\delta}). \tag{7.16}$$

In this sense we will use that an $\mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha})$ perturbation of the Hamiltonian yields an error estimate of almost the same order for the difference of the corresponding densities $\rho-\tilde\rho$.

The Hamiltonians we use are

$$\begin{aligned} H_S &= \tfrac{|p|^2}{2} + \tfrac{1}{2}\big(\phi\cdot\check{V}(X)\phi + \check{V}(X)\phi\cdot\phi\big) - E \\ H_E &= \tfrac{|p|^2}{2} + \phi\cdot V(X)\phi - E \\ H_{BO} &= \tfrac{|p|^2}{2} + \lambda_0(X) - E \end{aligned}$$

with the cost functions

$$\begin{aligned} h_S &= E + \tfrac{|p|^2}{2} + \tfrac{1}{2}\big(\phi_i\cdot\check{V}(X)\phi_i + \check{V}(X)\phi_i\cdot\phi_i - \phi_r\cdot\check{V}(X)\phi_r - \check{V}(X)\phi_r\cdot\phi_r\big) \\ h_E &= E + \tfrac{|p|^2}{2} + \big(\phi_i\cdot V(X)\phi_i - \phi_r\cdot V(X)\phi_r\big) \\ h_{BO} &= E + \tfrac{|p|^2}{2} - \lambda_0(X) \end{aligned}$$

and the primal and dual variable $(Y;q) = (X, 2^{1/2}M^{-1/4}\phi_r; p, 2^{1/2}M^{-1/4}\phi_i)$ in the case of Schrödinger and Ehrenfest dynamics, as in (2.22), and the variable $(Y;q) = (X, (\psi_0)_r; p, (\psi_0)_i)$ for the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics. For the Born-Oppenheimer case the electron wave function is the eigenstate ψ_0; one can identify the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics with an Ehrenfest dynamics where the mass is set to infinity, since in this limit the Ehrenfest wave function becomes the eigenfunction, see Section 7.4.

Remark 7.1. This remark derives the stability estimate (7.12). The definition of the value functions imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\underbrace{\tilde\theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) - \int_0^{\tilde\tau}\tilde h(\tilde q_t,\tilde Y_t)\,\mathrm{d}t}_{\tilde\theta(\tilde Y_0)} - \underbrace{\big(\theta(Y_\tau) - \int_0^{\tau} h(q_t,Y_t)\,\mathrm{d}t\big)}_{\theta(Y_0)} \\ &= -\textstyle\int_0^{\tilde\tau}\tilde h(\tilde q_t,\tilde Y_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) - \underbrace{\theta(Y_0)}_{\theta(\tilde Y_0)} + \tilde\theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) - \theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) \\ &= -\textstyle\int_0^{\tilde\tau}\tilde h(\tilde q_t,\tilde Y_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^{\tilde\tau}\mathrm{d}\theta(\tilde Y_t) + \tilde\theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) - \theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) \\ &= \textstyle\int_0^{\tilde\tau}\underbrace{-\tilde h(\tilde q_t,\tilde Y_t) + \partial_Y\theta(\tilde Y_t)\bullet\partial_q\tilde H(\tilde q_t,\tilde Y_t)}_{\le\tilde H\left(\partial_Y\theta(\tilde Y_t),\tilde Y_t\right)}\,\mathrm{d}t + \tilde\theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) - \theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) \\ &\le \textstyle\int_0^{\tilde\tau}(\tilde H - H)\big(\partial_Y\theta(\tilde Y_t),\tilde Y_t\big)\,\mathrm{d}t + \tilde\theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}) - \theta(\tilde Y_{\tilde\tau}), \end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

where the Pontryagin principle (7.10) yields the inequality and we use the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$H(\partial_Y\theta(\tilde Y_t),\tilde Y_t) = 0.$$

To establish the lower bound, replace θ along $\tilde Y_t$ by $\tilde\theta$ along Y_t and repeat the derivation above.

7.4. **The Born-Oppenheimer approximation.**

7.4.1. *With an electron eigenvalue gap.* To better understand the evolution (2.17) of $\hat\psi$ and estimate the error term in (6.3), we use the decomposition $\hat\psi = \psi_0 \oplus \psi^\perp$, where $\psi_0(t)$ is an electron eigenvector of $V_t = V(\hat X_t)$, satisfying $V_t\psi_0(t) = \lambda_0(t)\psi_0(t)$ in $L^2(dx)$ for an eigenvalue $\lambda_0(t)\in\mathbf{R}$, and $\psi^\perp$ is chosen orthogonal to ψ_0 in the sense $\psi^\perp\cdot\psi_0 = 0$. We assume that the electron eigenfunction $\psi_0(X) : \mathbf{T}^{3J}\to\mathbf{R}$ is smooth as a function of X. This *Ansatz* is motivated by the residual

$$R\psi_0 := \dot\psi_0 + iM^{1/2}(V - V_0)\psi_0 \tag{7.18}$$

being small. Below we verify that $\psi^\perp$ is $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ with a spectral gap assumption and $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4})$ for a case without a spectral gap; in the case of a spectral gap, this estimate yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot\psi_0\cdot\psi_0 &= -\dot\psi^\perp\cdot\psi^\perp = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}) \\ M^{1/2}(V - V_0)\psi_0 &= \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$V_0 = \frac{(\psi_0+\psi^\perp)\cdot V_\tau(\psi_0+\psi^\perp)}{(\psi_0+\psi^\perp)\cdot(\psi_0+\psi^\perp)} = \lambda_0(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$$

for $\psi_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and

$$\dot{\psi^\perp}\cdot\psi^\perp = \dot{X}\bullet\partial_X\psi^\perp\cdot\psi^\perp = \mathcal{O}(M^0M^{-1/2}).$$

The Schrödinger equation $R\hat{\psi} = 0$ in (2.17) implies that the perturbation $\psi^\perp$ satisfies the following Schrödinger equation with the source term $iR\psi_0$

$$i\dot{\psi^\perp} = M^{1/2}(V-V_0)\psi^\perp - iR\psi_0 \tag{7.19}$$

and the solution representation

$$\psi^\perp(t) = \hat{S}_{t,0}\psi^\perp(0) - \int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}R\psi_0(s)ds \tag{7.20}$$

for the solution operator $\hat{\psi}_t =: \hat{S}_{t,0}\hat{\psi}_0$. Split the source term into its projection on ψ_0 and its orthogonal part

$$R\psi_0 = \frac{R\psi_0\cdot\psi_0}{\psi_0\cdot\psi_0}\,\psi_0 \oplus R\psi_0^\perp$$

and note that it is enough to study the projected source term $R\psi_0^\perp$ to determine $\psi^\perp$ on the orthogonal complement of ψ_0. Integrate by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}R\psi_0^\perp(s)ds &= \int_0^t \underbrace{\frac{d}{ds}(\hat{S}_{t,s})iM^{-1/2}(V-V_0)^{-1}}_{=\hat{S}_{t,s}} R\psi_0^\perp(s)ds\\ &= iM^{-1/2}\Big[\hat{S}_{t,s}(V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp(s)\Big]_{s=0}^t\\ &\quad -iM^{-1/2}\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}\tfrac{d}{ds}\big((V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp\big)(s)ds.\end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

If there is a *spectral gap*

$$\inf_{n\neq 0, t>0}|\lambda_n(\hat{X}_t) - \lambda_0(\hat{X}_t)| > c, \tag{7.22}$$

for a positive constant c, we have

$$(V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp = \sum_{n\geq 0}(V-V_0)^{-1}\psi_n\ R\psi_0^\perp\cdot\psi_n = \sum_{n\neq 0}(\lambda_n-V_0)^{-1}\psi_n\ R\psi_0^\perp\cdot\psi_n\ = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

We have by (7.20) and (7.21)

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^\perp(t) = \hat{S}_{t,0}\big(\psi^\perp(0) - iM^{-1/2}(V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp(0)\big) + iM^{-1/2}(V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp(t)\\ \underbrace{- iM^{-1/2}\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}\frac{d}{ds}\big((V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp\big)(s)ds}_{=\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})},\end{aligned}$$

where the last integral can be integrated by parts again as in (7.21) to reduce the integral with a factor $M^{-1/2}$. By choosing $\psi^\perp(0) = iM^{-1/2}(V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp(0)$ we have

$$\psi^\perp(t) = iM^{-1/2}(V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp(t) + \underbrace{iM^{-1/2}\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}\frac{d}{ds}\big((V-V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp\big)(s)ds}_{\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})}. \tag{7.23}$$

We may use that the paths $\hat{X}_t$ return to the co-dimension one "return" surface I, defined in (2.6), after time $t = \mathcal{O}(1)$ which by (7.21) then yields

$$\| \int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s} R\psi_0^\perp(s) ds \|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}), \tag{7.24}$$

and if longer return times are needed the integration by parts can be iterated k times to gain a factor of $M^{-k/2}$ in the integral. The function $\psi^\perp$ is then determined by (7.20) from the initial $\hat{X} \in I$ and its successive returns to the set I, similarly as the phase function θ in (2.6). Therefore, the L^2 unitarity of $\hat{S}_{t,0}$ together with the bound (7.24) imply in (7.20) that the Ehrenfest approximation $\hat{\psi} = \psi_0 + \hat{\psi}^\perp$ satisfies

$$\|\psi^\perp\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}), \tag{7.25}$$

where (7.23) shows that the error in different hitting time intervals do not substantially accumulate in time. Since the function ψ_0 depends smoothly on X and a derivative of the integral in (7.23) yields at most a factor $M^{1/2}$ (when differentiating the solution operator $\hat{S}$), equation (7.23) shows that the derivative with respect to the Lagrange coordinates satisfies

$$\|\partial\psi^\perp\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}),$$

and integrating by parts once more in (7.23) also gives

$$\|\partial^2\psi^\perp\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}). \tag{7.26}$$

7.4.2. *With crossing electron eigenvalues.* Since the solution operator is unitary it can be written as a highly oscillatory exponential: $\hat{S}_{t,s} = e^{iM^{1/2}Q(s)}$, where Q is an essentially self-adjoint operator, cf. [3]. Therefore, the method of stationary phase, cf. [41] and Section 7.5, can be applied to extend (7.21) to the case when $\lambda_n - V_0$ has finitely many non degenerate critical points σ_k, where the eigenvalue crossings satisfy

$$|\frac{d}{ds}\big(\lambda_n(s) - \lambda_0(s)\big)|_{s=\sigma_k} > c \quad \text{for a positive constant } c \text{ and } n \neq 0. \tag{7.27}$$

With this assumption, the method of stationary phase, see Section 7.5, implies

$$\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s} R\psi_0^\perp(s) ds = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4}),$$

and

$$\|\psi^\perp\| = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4}), \tag{7.28}$$

since by letting the hitting surface I include the points where the electron eigenvalue cross we have

$$\psi^\perp(t) = \hat{S}_{t,0}\big(\psi^\perp(0) + M^{-1/4} r\big)$$

for a smooth and bounded function r of X and for times t close to the time of a path hitting crossing eigenvalues. To obtain bounds on the derivatives, we note that if the initial data on the hitting surface is chosen as $\psi^\perp(0) = -M^{-1/4} r + \mathcal{O}(M^{-5/4})$, we obtain

$$\|\partial^2\psi^\perp\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4}), \tag{7.29}$$

since two derivatives of the solution operator increases the result by at most a factor $\mathcal{O}(M)$.

7.4.3. *Difference of Hamiltonians.* To estimate the difference in the Hamiltonians we use the bounds (7.26) and (7.29) on derivatives

$$\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{G} \sum_k \Delta_{X_k}(\hat{G}^{-1}\hat{\psi}) = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

in the Lagrange coordinates. We conclude that

$$\begin{array}{ll} (H_S - H_E)(\hat{X},\hat{p},\hat{\psi}) & = \frac{1}{2M}\hat{\psi} \cdot \hat{G} \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(\hat{G}^{-1}\hat{\psi}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{spectral gap} \\ \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{crossings} \end{array} \right. \\ (H_E - H_{BO})(\hat{X},\hat{p},\hat{\psi}) & = \hat{\psi} \cdot (V - \lambda_0)\hat{\psi} = \psi^\perp \cdot (V - \lambda_0)\psi^\perp = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{spectral gap} \\ \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}) & \text{crossings.} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \tag{7.30}$$

The largest bound $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ for crossing eigenvalues can possibly be improved, since when the eigenvalues cross we did not use the smallness of $\psi^\perp \cdot (V - V_0)\psi^\perp$ in the neighborhood of crossing eigenvalues but only the size of $\psi^\perp = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4})$: in a neighborhood of the crossing point the function $\psi^\perp$ increases from $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ outside to $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ inside, for the component corresponding to the crossing eigenvalue, while $(V - \lambda_0)\psi^\perp$ vanishes asymptotically at the crossing; a careful balance of the size of this neighborhood and of $(V - \lambda_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp$ outside could give a better estimate of $\psi^\perp \cdot (V - \lambda_0)\psi^\perp$.

7.4.4. *Estimates of the Hamiltonian for the density.* We have $\psi = G^{-1}(\psi_0 + \psi^\perp)$. To conclude that (7.14) holds, we split into three terms where the first is

$$\Im\big(G^{-1}\psi_0 \cdot \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\psi_0)\big) = 0$$

since all functions here are real valued; then we have

$$M^{-1/2}\Im\big(G^{-1}\psi_0 \cdot \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\psi^\perp) + G^{-1}\psi^\perp \cdot \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\psi_0\big) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{spectral gap} \\ \mathcal{O}(M^{-3/4}) & \text{crossings} \end{array} \right. \tag{7.31}$$

and

$$M^{-1/2}\Im\big(G^{-1}\psi^\perp \cdot \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\psi^\perp)\big) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{O}(M^{-3/2}) & \text{spectral gap} \\ \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{crossings.} \end{array} \right.$$

by the derivative bounds (7.26) and (7.29). We conclude that

$$M^{-1/2}\Im(\psi \cdot \sum_n \Delta_{X_n}\psi)/(\psi \cdot \psi) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{spectral gap} \\ \mathcal{O}(M^{-3/4}) & \text{crossings.} \end{array} \right. \tag{7.32}$$

7.5. **The stationary phase method.**

7.5.1. *Real valued phases.* The theory of semi-classical approximations [41, 14] use the method of stationary phase to reduce the study of oscillatory integrals

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{iM^{1/2}Q(s)} f(s) ds \tag{7.33}$$

to points σ where the real valued phase function Q is stationary, i.e. $Q'(\sigma) = 0$, as follows; such integrals over domains away from the critical points σ_k, yields by the integration by parts (7.21) contributions of size $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$. In a neighborhood of a critical point $\sigma = 0$, the phase can by Taylors formula by written

$$Q(s) = Q(0) + \frac{1}{2}\underbrace{\int_0^1 Q''(ts)dt}_{=:\bar{Q}(s)}\ s^2.$$

Introduce the change of variables $\tilde{s} := s(\bar{Q}(s)/\bar{Q}(0))^{1/2}$ and its inverse map $s(\tilde{s})$ to write

$$\int_0^\infty e^{iM^{1/2}s^2\bar{Q}(s)/2} f(s)ds = \int_0^\infty e^{iM^{1/2}\tilde{s}^2\bar{Q}(0)/2} \underbrace{f\big(s(\tilde{s})\big)s'(\tilde{s})}_{=:\tilde{f}(\tilde{s})} d\tilde{s}$$

The corresponding error term based on the integral over the domain $(-\infty, 0)$ defines $\tilde{f}$ on $(-\infty, 0)$. Fourier transformation $\mathcal{F}$, following [14], shows the expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{iM^{1/2}s^2Q''(0)}\tilde{f}(s)ds \\
&= \textstyle\int_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{F}\big(e^{iM^{1/2}s^2Q''(0)}\big)(\omega)\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big(\tilde{f}(s)\big)(\omega)d\omega \\
&= \textstyle\int_{\mathbf{R}} (2\pi)^{1/2}M^{-1/4}|Q''(0)|^{-1/2}e^{i\pi\mathrm{sgn}Q''(0)/4}e^{-i(Q'')^{-1}M^{-1/2}\omega^2/2}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big(\tilde{f}(s)\big)(\omega)d\omega \\
&\sim (2\pi)^{1/2}M^{-1/4}|\,Q''(0)|^{-1/2}e^{i\pi\mathrm{sgn}Q''(0)/4}\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{M^{-k/2}}{k!}(iQ''(0)^{-1}\partial_s^2)^k\tilde{f}(s)\Big|_{s=0}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.34}$$

The original integral (7.33) can by a smooth partition of unity be split into a sum of the integrals over domains containing only one or no critical point.

The stationary phase method can be extended to oscillatory integrals in $\mathbf{R}^{3N}$, with the factor $M^{-1/4}$ replaced by $M^{-3N/4}$ and $|Q''(0)|$ replaced by $|\det Q''(0)|$ in (7.34), cf. [14, 41].

7.5.2. *Self-adjoint phases.* In this section we extend the stationary phase method to the phase generated by the solution operator $\hat{S}$. Since $\hat{S}$ is unitary, we can write the solution operator $\hat{S}_{t,s} = e^{iM^{1/2}Q_{t,s}}$, where $Q_{t,s}$ is essentially self-adjoint in $L^2(dx)$. Therefore $Q_{t,s}$ has real eigenvalues $\{\check{\lambda}_n(s)\}$ with corresponding orthonormal real eigenfunctions $\{\check{p}_n(s)\}$ (satisfying $Q_s\check{p}_n(s) = \check{\lambda}_n(s)\check{p}_n(s)$) that transforms the operator valued phase to a sum of real valued phases

$$\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}R_s ds = \int_0^t e^{iM^{1/2}Q_s}R_s ds = \sum_n \int_0^t e^{iM^{1/2}\check{\lambda}_n(s)} \underbrace{(\check{p}_n(s)\cdot R_s)\ \check{p}_n(s)}_{=(\check{p}_n(t)\cdot R_s)\ \check{p}_n(t)} ds$$

and the stationary phase method can now be applied to each term separately.

Note that $\check{p}_n(t)$ does not depend on s, since the data for $\check{p}_n$ is that they are the eigenfunctions of $\dot{Q}_{t,t} = V - V_0$ at time t: the eigenvalue relation

$$(t-s)^{-1}Q_{t,s}\check{p}_n(s) = (t-s)^{-1}\check{\lambda}_n(s)\check{p}_n(s)$$

and $(t-s)^{-1}Q_{t,s} \to V - V_0$ as $s \to t$ shows that $\check{p}_n(t)$ are the eigenfunctions to $V - V_0$; let $f_n(t) := e^{iM^{1/2}\check{\lambda}_n(s)}\check{p}_n(s)$, then the continuity at t implies $f_n(t) = \check{p}_n(t)$, so that $\check{p}_n(t) = e^{iM^{1/2}\check{\lambda}_n(s;t)}\check{p}_n(s;t)$, which yields $(\check{p}_n(s)\cdot R_s)\ \check{p}_n(s) = (\check{p}_n(t)\cdot R_s)\ \check{p}_n(t)$.

The definition of Q_s implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{d}{ds}Q_s &= V(\hat{X}_s) - V_0(\hat{X}_s) \\
\tfrac{d^2}{ds^2}Q_s &= \tfrac{d}{ds}\big(V(\hat{X}_s) - V_0(\hat{X}_s)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

and by differentiation of the eigenvalue relation we obtain

$$\frac{d}{ds}\check{\lambda}_n(s) = \check{p}_n\cdot(V - V_0)\check{p}_n(s).$$

When $t \to s$ we obtain $\dot{\check{\lambda}}_n = \lambda_n$ and $\ddot{\check{\lambda}}_n = \dot{\lambda}_n$, so that the condition (6.5) for crossing eigenvalues of λ_n yields the condition for non degenerate critical points of $\check{\lambda}_n$.

Our analysis shows that

$$\check{p}_0(t) = e^{iM^{1/2}\check{\lambda}_n(s;t)}\check{p}_0(s) = \hat{S}_{t,s}\check{p}_0(s)$$

which by (7.28) satisfies $\check{p}_0 = \psi_0 + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4})$. Analogously, with a similar assumption on non degenerate critical points in $\check{\lambda}_m - \check{\lambda}_n$, for all m and n, we obtain for the other eigenfunctions $e^{iM^{1/2}\int_s^t V_n(r)-V_0(r)dr}\check{p}_n(s) = \psi_n + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4})$, and we can conclude that $\check{p}_n$ is $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4})$ close to the electron eigenfunction ψ_n.

7.5.3. *Analysis of the Schrödinger dynamics.* The analysis above can be applied to the exact solution operator $S_{t,s} = e^{iM^{1/2}Q_s}$ and $\tilde{V}$ replacing the Ehrenfest operator $\hat{S}$ and $V - V_0$. Let $\tilde{\psi} = \psi_0 \oplus \tilde{\psi}^\perp$, then $\tilde{\psi}_t = S_{t,0}\tilde{\psi}_0$ and $R\psi_0 = \dot{\psi}_0 - M^{1/2}\tilde{V}\psi_0$. Integrate by parts to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t S_{t,s}R\psi_0^\perp(s)ds &= \int_0^t \underbrace{\frac{d}{ds}(S_{t,s})iM^{-1/2}\tilde{V}^{-1}}_{=S_{t,s}} R\psi_0^\perp(s)ds \\
&= iM^{-1/2}\Big[S_{t,s}\tilde{V}^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp(s)\Big]_{s=0}^t \\
&\quad -iM^{-1/2}\int_0^t \hat{S}_{t,s}\tfrac{d}{ds}\big(\tilde{V}^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp\big)(s)ds
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.35}
$$

and use

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{V}^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp &= \big(I + (\tilde{V} - V - V_0)(V - V_0)^{-1}\big)^{-1}(V - V_0)^{-1}R\psi_0^\perp \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{n\neq 0}\big(I + (\tilde{V} - V - V_0)(V - V_0)^{-1}\big)^{-1}(\lambda_n - V_0)^{-1}\psi_n R\psi_0^\perp\cdot\psi_n \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{n\neq 0}(\lambda_n - V_0)^{-1}\psi_n R\psi_0^\perp\cdot\psi_n + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1})
\end{aligned}
$$

to deduce as before that $\tilde{\psi}^\perp = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$ when the spectral gap condition holds and ψ_n are smooth.

In the case of crossing eigenvalues, the method of stationary phase, projected to the eigenfunction of the singularity, is applicable with S, in the weighted scalar product $\int v\cdot wG^{-2}dX$ where the symmetric generator is $(V - V_0)G^{-1}\tilde{\psi} - (2M)^{-1}\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\tilde{\psi})$. In the new variable $\psi = G^{-1}\tilde{\psi}$ the operator becomes $V - V_0 - (2M)^{-1}\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}$ with its time derivative equal to $d(V - V_0)/dt$, as in the Ehrenfest case. The method of stationary phase for S can therefore be used to study the behavior of the oscillatory integral $\int_0^t S_{t,s}R\psi_0^\perp$ in the subspace of a single eigenfunction ψ_n, in a neighborhood a critical point where $\lambda_n - V_0$ vanish, $n \neq 0$; in the orthogonal subspace to ψ_n and ψ_0, the oscillatory integral can be estimated by integration by parts as in (7.35). With such a projection into a single eigenfunction direction, the source term is $R\psi_0^\perp\cdot\psi_n$ and the non degeneracy condition for the stationary phase method becomes

$$
|\psi_n\cdot\ddot{Q}(0)\psi_n| = |\psi_n\cdot d(V - V_0)/dt\psi_n| = |\dot{\lambda}_n - \dot{V}_0| > c.
$$

Note that the projection to a one dimensional subspace is possible when the critical points of the different eigenvalues are separated. If two or more eigenvalues have the same critical point, a more careful study would be needed.

In conclusion we have the same estimates for $\tilde{\psi} =: \psi_0 \oplus \tilde{\psi}^\perp$ as for $\hat{\psi}$:

$$
\|\tilde{\psi}^\perp\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2}) \tag{7.36}
$$

with a spectral gap, respectively

$$
\|\tilde{\psi}^\perp\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1/4}) \tag{7.37}
$$

with non degenerate eigenvalue crossings, and as in (7.31), we also obtain

$$
\frac{1}{2M}\tilde{\psi}\cdot\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\tilde{\psi}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{with a spectral gap} \\ \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) & \text{with eigenvalue crossings.} \end{cases} \tag{7.38}
$$

7.6. **Error estimates for the densities.** The densities are

$$\begin{array}{ll} \rho_S & = G^{-2}\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi} \quad \text{for the Schrödinger equation} \\ \rho_E & = \hat{G}^{-2} \quad \text{for the Ehrenfest dynamics} \\ \rho_{BO} & = \bar{G}^{-2} \quad \text{for the Born-Oppenheimer dynamics.} \end{array}$$

We have from (7.30), (7.36-7.38) and (7.16)

$$\begin{array}{ll} G^{-2} & = \hat{G}^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}) \\ G^{-2} & = \bar{G}^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}) \end{array}$$

and by (7.36-7.37)

$$\tilde{\psi}\cdot\tilde{\psi} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}), \tag{7.39}$$

which proves

$$\begin{array}{ll} \rho_S & = \rho_E + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}) \\ \rho_S & = \rho_{BO} + \mathcal{O}(M^{-\alpha}), \end{array}$$

where

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for the spectral gap condition (6.4)} \\ 1/2 & \text{for non degenerate eigenvalue crossings (6.5).} \end{cases}$$

The sharper estimate for the density obtained using (7.16) and (7.32), instead of (7.39), improves the error bound to $\mathcal{O}(M^{-3/4})$ in (7.39) for the case of Ehrenfest dynamics approximating Schrödinger observables with crossing electron eigenvalues.

8. Approximation of stochastic WKB states by stochastic dynamics

In this section we analyze a situation when the WKB eigenstate, (corresponding to a degenerate eigenvalue of the Schrödinger equation (1.1)) is perturbed from the corresponding electron ground state by thermal fluctuations, which will lead to molecular dynamics in the canonical ensemble with constant number of particles, volume and temperature. To determine the stochastic data for the Schrödinger wave function ϕ in (7.9) requires some additional assumptions. Inspired by the study of a classical heat bath of harmonic oscillators in [52], we will sample ϕ randomly from a probability density given by an *equilibrium solution* f (satisfying $\partial_t f = 0$) of the *Liouville equation* $\partial_t f + \partial_{p_S} H_S \partial_{r_S} f - \partial_{r_S} H_S \partial_{p_S} f = 0$, to the Schrödinger Hamiltonian dynamics (7.9). There are many such equilibrium solutions, e.g. $f = h(H_S)$ for any differentiable function h and there may also be equilibrium densities that are not functions of the Hamiltonian. The Hamiltonians for the Schrödinger and Ehrenfest dynamics differ by the term

$$\frac{1}{M}\Re\big(\phi\cdot G\sum_n \Delta_{X_n}(G^{-1}\phi)\big)$$

which is small of ϕ is smooth enough, as was verified in Theorems 6.1 and 6.2. Since the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian is simpler to understand, in particular showing that smooth ϕ are most probable, we first focus on the Ehrenfest dynamics.

To find the equilibrium solution to sample ϕ from, we may first consider the marginal equilibrium distribution for the nuclei in the Ehrenfest Hamiltonian system. The equilibrium distribution of the nuclei is simpler to understand than the equilibrium of electrons: in a statistical mechanics view, the conditinal probability of finding the now classical nuclei with the energy $H_E := 2^{-1}|p|^2 + \phi\cdot V(X)\phi$, for given ϕ, in (2.22) is proportional to the Gibbs-Boltzmann factor $\exp(-H_E/T)$, where the positive parameter T is the temperature, in units of the Boltzmann constant, cf. [20], [30]. Assuming that the equilibrium density is a function of the Hamiltonian and that the marginal distribution for p is the Boltzmann distribution proportional to $e^{-|p|^2/(2T)}$, its marginal distribution therefore satisfies

$$\int h\big(2^{-1}|p|^2 + \phi\cdot V(X)\phi\big)d\phi_r d\phi_i = e^{-|p|^2/(2T)}C(X)$$

for some function $C : \mathbf{R}^{3N} \to \mathbf{R}$ and Fourier transformation with respect to $|p| \in \mathbf{R}$ of this equation implies the *Gibbs distribution*

$$h(H_E) = ce^{-H_E/T},$$

for a normalizing constant $c = 1/\int \exp(-H_E/T)d\phi_r d\phi_i dX dp$. In this perspective *the nuclei act as the heat bath for the electrons*. The work [33] considers Hamiltonian systems where the equilibrium densities are assumed to be a function of the Hamiltonian and shows that the first and second law of (reversible) thermodynamics hold (for all Hamiltonians depending on a multidimensional set of parameters) if and only if the density is the Gibbs exponential $\exp(-H_E/T)$ (the "if" part was formulated already by Gibbs [25]); in this sense, the Gibbs distribution is more stable than other equilibrium solutions. An alternative motivation of the Gibbs distribution, based on the conclusion of this work (in a somewhat circular argument), is that the nuclei can be approximated by classical Langevin dynamics with the unique invariant density $\exp\big(-|p|^2/2 - \lambda_0(X)\big)/T$, which is an accurate approximation of the marginal distribution of $\exp(-H_E/T)$ when integrating over all the electron states ϕ, see Lemma 8.1 and Theorem 8.3. Note that there is only one function of the Hamiltonian where the momenta p_j are independent and that is when $f(r_E, p_E)$ is proportional to $\exp(-H_E/T)$.

Since the energy is conserved for the Ehrenfest dynamics –now viewed with the electrons as the primary systems coupled to the heat bath of nuclei– the probability of finding the electrons in a certain configuration ϕ is the same as finding the nuclei in a state with energy H_E, which is proportional to $\exp(-H_E/T)$ in the canonical ensemble. This conclusion, that the probability to have an electron wave function ϕ is proportional to $\exp(-H_E/T)d\phi^r d\phi^i$ is our motivation to sample the data for ϕ from the conditioned density generated be $\exp(-\phi \cdot V(X)\phi/T)d\phi^r d\phi^i$: since we seek data for the electrons, we use the probability distribution for ϕ conditioned on (X, p).

In (5.2) we established the asymptotic density $\sum_n \hat{\rho}_n r_n$ for a multiple state system with probability r_n for eigenstate n, as defined in (4.2). The case of the Gibbs ensemble therefore yields the asymptotic relation

$$\frac{\sum_n \hat{\rho}_n r_n}{\sum_n r_n} \simeq \frac{\int e^{-H_E/T} dp d\phi}{\int e^{-H_E/T} dp d\phi dX}. \tag{8.1}$$

We compare in Remark 8.2 our model of stochastic data with a more standard model having given probabilities to be in mixed states, which is not an equilibrium solution of the Ehrenfest dynamics. To sample from the Gibbs equilibrium density is standard in classical Hamiltonian statistical mechanics but it seems non standard for Ehrenfest quantum dynamics.

8.0.1. *The Constrained Stochastic Data.* As in models of heat baths [22, 21] and [52] we assume that the data of the light particles (here the electrons) are stochastic, sampled from an equilibrium distribution of the Liouville equation. All states in this distribution correspond to pure eigenstates of the full Schrödinger operator with energy E. There are many such states and here we use the canonical ensemble where the data is in state ϕ with the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution proportional to $\exp(-H_E/T)d\phi^r d\phi^i dp\, dX$, i.e. in any state ϕ, for $\|\phi\| = 1$, with probability weight

$$e^{-\phi \cdot V\phi/T} d\phi^r d\phi^i.$$

Let us now determine precise properties of this distribution generated by the Hamiltonian H_E. To reduce the complication of the constraint $\phi \cdot \phi = 1$, we change variables $\phi = \tilde{\phi}/(\tilde{\phi} \cdot \tilde{\phi})^{1/2}$ and write the Hamiltonian equilibrium density as

$$\exp\Big(-\big(p \bullet p/2 + \lambda_0 + \frac{\tilde{\phi} \cdot (V - \lambda_0)\tilde{\phi}}{\tilde{\phi} \cdot \tilde{\phi}}\big)/T\Big) d\tilde{\phi}^r d\tilde{\phi}^i dp\, dX. \tag{8.2}$$

Diagonalize the electron operator $V(X^t)$ by the normalized eigenvectors and eigenvalues $\{\bar{p}_j, \lambda_j\}$

$$\tilde{\phi} \cdot V(X^t)\tilde{\phi} = \lambda_0 + \sum_{j>0} \underbrace{(\lambda_j - \lambda_0)}_{=:\,\bar{\lambda}_j} |\gamma_j|^2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi} &= \textstyle\sum_{j\geq 0} \gamma_j \bar{p}_j, \\ (V-\lambda_0)\bar{p}_j &= \bar{\lambda}_j \bar{p}_j, \\ \bar{\lambda}_0 &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

with real and imaginary parts $\gamma_j =: \gamma_j^r + i\gamma_j^i$. The orthogonal transformation $\tilde{\phi} = \sum_j \gamma_j \bar{p}_j$ shows that the probability density (8.2) is given by

$$\mathcal{D} := \frac{\left(\prod_{j\geq 0} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j|\gamma_j|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_j^r\, d\gamma_j^i\right) e^{-(p\bullet p/2+\lambda_0(X))/T} dp\, dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{6N}} \left(\prod_{j\geq 0}\int_{\mathbf{R}^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j|\gamma_j|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_j^r\, d\gamma_j^i\right) e^{-(p\bullet p/2+\lambda_0(X))/T} dp\, dX}\,, \tag{8.4}$$

using that the determinant of the matrix of eigenvectors is one.

If we neglect the constraint and set $\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2 = 1$ the joint distribution density $\mathcal{D}$ is approximated by

$$\frac{\left(\prod_{j>0} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j|\gamma_j|^2/T} d\gamma_j^r\, d\gamma_j^i\right) e^{-(p\bullet p/2+\lambda_0(X))/T} dp\, dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{6N}} \left(\prod_{j>0}\int_{\mathbf{R}^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j|\gamma_j|^2/T} d\gamma_j^r\, d\gamma_j^i\right) e^{-(p\bullet p/2+\lambda_0(X))/T} dp\, dX},$$

where $\{\gamma_j^r, \gamma_j^i, j>0\}$ are independent and each γ_j^r and γ_j^i is normally distributed with mean zero and variance $T/\bar{\lambda}_j$. We see in Lemma 8.1 that this approximation is accurate, provided the spectral gap conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{T}{\lambda_1} \ll 1, \\ &\min_{X_c\in D} \max_{\substack{X\,\in\, D \\ Y = sX+(1-s)X_c \\ s\,\in\,[0,1]}} \left|\textstyle\sum_{j>0} \frac{\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_j(Y)\bullet(X-X_c)}{\bar{\lambda}_j(Y)}\right| =: \kappa \ll 1 \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

hold, where D is the set of attained nuclei positions for the Ehrenfest dynamics. The first condition implies that the temperature is small compared to the gap. The second condition means that the electron eigenvalues are almost parallel to the ground state eigenvalue, as a function of X. We have $\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_j = \bar{p}_j \cdot \partial_X (V-\lambda_0)\bar{p}_j$ which typically decays fast with growing eigenvalues, since $\partial_X(V-\lambda_0)$ is smooth and $\bar{p}_j$ become highly oscillatory as $j\to\infty$.

Lemma 8.1. *Assume the electron eigenvalues have a spectral gap around the ground state eigenvalue λ_0, in the sense that* (8.5) *holds. Then the marginal probability mass*

$$r(X) := \prod_{j\geq 0} \int_{|\gamma_j|^2<C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_j|\gamma_j|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_j^r\, d\gamma_j^i$$

satisfies

$$|\log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}| \leq \kappa\,. \tag{8.6}$$

Proof. We first note that $\|\phi\|_{L^2}$ is bounded so that each component $|\gamma_j|$ is also bounded. Each integral factor has the derivative

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_X \textstyle\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r\, d\gamma_n^i \\ &= \tfrac{\partial_X \bar{\lambda}_n(X)}{\bar{\lambda}_n(X)} \textstyle\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_n|\gamma_n|^2}{T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2} e^{-\bar{\lambda}_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r\, d\gamma_n^i \end{aligned}$$

for $n \neq 0$ and the derivative equal to zero for $n = 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_X r(X)\\ &= r(X) \textstyle\sum_{n>0} \frac{\partial_X \bar\lambda_n(X)}{\bar\lambda_n(X)} \, \frac{\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} \frac{\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2}{T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2} e^{-\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r \, d\gamma_n^i}{\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} e^{-\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r \, d\gamma_n^i}.\end{aligned}$$

The integral in the denominator has the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\textstyle\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} e^{-\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r \, d\gamma_n^i\\ &= \tfrac{T}{\bar\lambda_n} \textstyle\sum_{j\neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \int_{|\hat\gamma_n|^2<C'\bar\lambda_n/T} e^{-|\hat\gamma_n|^2/(1+\bar\lambda_n^{-1}T|\hat\gamma_n|^2)} d\hat\gamma_n^r \, d\hat\gamma_n^i\\ &= \tfrac{T}{\bar\lambda_n} \textstyle\sum_{j\neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \Big(\int_{|\hat\gamma_n|^2<\epsilon\bar\lambda_n/T} e^{-|\hat\gamma_n|^2/(1+\bar\lambda_n^{-1}T|\hat\gamma_n|^2)} d\hat\gamma_n^r \, d\hat\gamma_n^i\\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\bar\lambda_n T^{-1} e^{-\bar\lambda_n\epsilon/(2T)})\Big)\end{aligned}$$

using $\epsilon\bar\lambda_n/T < |\hat\gamma_n|^2 < C'\bar\lambda_n/T$ and $T/\bar\lambda_n \ll 1$ in this domain; the integral over the remaining domain satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\int_{|\hat\gamma_n|^2<\epsilon\bar\lambda_n/T} e^{-|\hat\gamma_n|^2} d\hat\gamma_n^r \, d\hat\gamma_n^i \quad &\leq \textstyle\int_{|\hat\gamma_n|^2<\epsilon\bar\lambda_n/T} e^{-|\hat\gamma_n|^2/(1+\bar\lambda_n^{-1}T|\hat\gamma_n|^2)} d\hat\gamma_n^r \, d\hat\gamma_n^i\\ &\leq (1+\epsilon) \textstyle\int_{|\hat\gamma_n|^2<\epsilon\bar\lambda_n/(T(1+\epsilon))} e^{-|\hat\gamma_n|^2} d\hat\gamma_n^r \, d\hat\gamma_n^i.\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\epsilon = 4T\bar\lambda_n^{-1}\log(\bar\lambda_n/T)$ to obtain

$$\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} e^{-\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r \, d\gamma_n^i = \frac{T}{\bar\lambda_n} \sum_{j\neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \Big(\pi + \mathcal{O}\big(T\bar\lambda_n^{-1}\log(\bar\lambda_n T^{-1})\big)\Big). \tag{8.7}$$

We have similarly

$$\begin{aligned}&\textstyle\int_{|\gamma_n|^2<C} \frac{\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2}{T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2} e^{-\bar\lambda_n|\gamma_n|^2/(T\sum_{j\geq 0}|\gamma_j|^2)} d\gamma_n^r \, d\gamma_n^i\\ &= \tfrac{T}{\bar\lambda_n} \textstyle\sum_{j\neq n} |\gamma_j|^2 \Big(\frac{\pi}{2} + \mathcal{O}\big(T\bar\lambda_n^{-1}\log(\bar\lambda_n T^{-1})\big)\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

which implies that

$$|\log \frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}| = |\int_0^1 \frac{\partial_X r}{r}\big(sX_c + (1-s)X\big) \bullet (X - X_c)\, ds| \leq \kappa. \tag{8.9}$$

□

Remark 8.2. *Entropy and the Standard Canonical Density Distribution.* Let q_j denote the probability of electron state j in the data ϕ. In the setting of the canonical distribution model there holds

$$q_j = e^{-\bar\lambda_j/T} / \sum_j e^{-\bar\lambda_j/T}, \tag{8.10}$$

which follows from maximizing the von Neumann entropy defined by $-\sum_j q_j \log q_j$, with the probability and energy constraints $\sum_j q_j = 1$ and $\sum_j \bar\lambda_j q_j =$ constant, see [24]. The stochastic model for the variable $|\gamma_j|^2$, measuring in (8.4) and (8.3) the probability to be in electron state j, is different from the model (8.10), since the Gibbs distribution $\frac{\int e^{-H_E/T} dp d\phi}{\int e^{-H_E/T} dp d\phi dX} = \sum_n \hat\rho_n r_n / \sum_n r_n$ in (8.3) includes both the density $\hat\rho_n$ and the weight $r_n := |\gamma_n|^2$ to be in electron state n.

8.0.2. *The stochastic molecular dynamics models.* In this subsection we consider the special case when the observable does not depend on the time variable (and the velocity). Then it is enough to determine an integral with respect to the invariant measure; there are several alternatives, cf. [9], and we focus on ensemble averages computed by stochastic Langevin and Smoluchowski dynamics. The observable in the Ehrenfest dynamics is then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X)e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}r(X)dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}r(X)dX} &= \frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X)e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}\,\frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}\,\frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}dX}\\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X)e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T+\log\frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}}dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T+\log\frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}}dX},\end{aligned} \tag{8.11}$$

where by Lemma 8.1

$$|\log\frac{r(X)}{r(X_c)}| \le \kappa,$$

which implies

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X)e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}r(X)dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}r(X)dX} = \frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} g(X)e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}dX} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa). \tag{8.12}$$

Let W_t denote the standard Brownian process (at time t) in $\mathbf{R}^{3N}$ with independent components and let K be any positive parameter. The stochastic Langevin dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= p_t dt\\ dp_t &= -\partial_X\lambda_0(X_t)dt - Kp_t dt + \sqrt{2TK}dW_t\end{aligned}$$

and the Smoluchowski dynamics

$$dX_s = -\partial_X\lambda_0(X_s)ds + \sqrt{2T}dW_s$$

has the unique invariant probability density

$$\frac{e^{-(p\bullet p/2+\lambda_0(X))/T}dp\,dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{6N}} e^{-(p\bullet p/2+\lambda_0(X))/T}dp\,dX}$$

respectively

$$\frac{e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}dX}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^{3N}} e^{-\lambda_0(X)/T}dX},$$

cf. [9]. We see that the invariant measure for the Smoluchowski dynamics and the marginal invariant measure of the Langevin dynamics are equal to the first term in the right hand side of (8.12) and we have proved

Theorem 8.3. *Both Langevin and Smoluchowski stochastic molecular dynamics approximate Gibbs Ehrenfest observables* (8.11) *with error bounded by* $\mathcal{O}(\kappa)$*, provided the spectral gap condition* (8.5) *holds.*

If we assume that

$$\text{the matrix } \bar{p}_n \cdot G\textstyle\sum_k \Delta_{X_k}(G^{-1}\bar{p}_m) \text{ is (uniformly in } X\text{) bounded in } \ell^2, \tag{8.13}$$

then the difference of the Schrödinger and Ehrenfest Hamiltonians has the bound

$$\begin{aligned} M^{-1}|\Re\big(\phi\cdot G\textstyle\sum_k \Delta_{X_k}(G^{-1}\phi)\big)| &= M^{-1}|\Re\big(\sum_{n,m}\gamma_n^*\gamma_m\bar{p}_n\cdot G\sum_k\Delta_{X_k}(G^{-1}\bar{p}_m)\big)|\\ &\le \mathcal{O}(M^{-1})\textstyle\sum_n|\gamma_n|^2,\end{aligned}$$

which is asymptotically negligible compared to the Ehrenfest potential energy

$$\phi\cdot V\phi = \sum_n \bar{\lambda}_n|\gamma_n|^2,$$

and we obtain

Corollary 8.4. *Both Langevin and Smoluchowski molecular dynamics approximate Gibbs Schrödinger observables*

$$\int g(X)e^{-H_S(X,p,\phi)/T}dXdpd\phi/\int e^{-H_S(X,p,\phi)/T}dXdpd\phi$$

with error bounded by $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1}+\kappa)$*, provided* (8.5) *and* (8.13) *hold.*

By combining (8.7) and (8.8), the proof in Lemma 8.1 in fact shows

$$\partial_X \log r(X) = \frac{T}{2}\sum_{n>0}\frac{\partial_X\bar{\lambda}_n}{\bar{\lambda}_n} + \mathcal{O}(1)\sum_{n>0}|\partial_{X_j}\bar{\lambda}_n|\bar{\lambda}_n^{-2}\log\bar{\lambda}_n^{-1}$$

which together with (8.9) and (8.11) imply

Theorem 8.5. *If we instead of the gap condition* (8.5) *assume the weaker condition*

$$\begin{array}{ll} T\bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} & \ll 1 \\ \sum_{n>0}|\partial_{X_j}\bar{\lambda}_n|\bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} & = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \sum_{n>0}|\partial_{X_j}\bar{\lambda}_n|\bar{\lambda}_n^{-2}\log\bar{\lambda}_n^{-1} & = \kappa \ll 1, \end{array} \tag{8.14}$$

then the results in Theorem 8.3 and Corollary 8.4 hold, provided the Born-Oppenheimer potential λ_0 *is replaced by*

$$\lambda_0(X) + \frac{T}{2}\sum_{n>0}\log\bar{\lambda}_n(X).$$

Note that the correction can be written as

$$\frac{T}{2}\mathrm{trace}^{\perp}\log(V-\lambda_0)$$

where $\mathrm{trace}^{\perp}$ is the trace in the orthogonal complement of the electron ground state ψ_0 satisfying $V\psi_0 = \lambda_0\psi_0$.

The work [49] shows that Langevin dynamics, using the rank one friction and diffusion matrix

$$K = K(X) = 2M^{-1/2}\partial_X\psi_0(X)\cdot\partial_X\psi_0(X),$$

approximates time-dependent observables based on the Ehrenfest dynamics with the accuracy $o(M^{-1/2})$ on bounded time intervals if $\kappa = O(M^{-1/2})$.

Theorem 8.3 is relevant for the central problem in statistical mechanics to show that Hamiltonian dynamics of heavy particles, coupled to a heat bath of many lighter particles with random initial data, can be approximately described by Langevin's equation, as motivated by the pioneering work [17],[34] and continued with more precise heat bath models, based on harmonic interactions, in [22, 21] [52].

9. Discrete spectrum

This section verifies that the symmetric bilinear form

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v\bar{V}_\tau v + \gamma v^2 \; dxdX_0$$

is continuous and coercive on $H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$ also for the Coulomb potential, which implies that the spectrum of $\bar{V}$ is discrete by the theory of compact operators, see [18]. Let $r := |x^j - X^n|$. Integrate by parts, for any $\epsilon > 0$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_0^R \tfrac{1}{|x^j-X^n|}v^2r^2dr &= -\int_0^R \tfrac{1}{r}v^2r^2dr \\ &= -\int_0^R v^2\partial_r\tfrac{r^2}{2}dr \\ &= \int_0^R v\partial_r v\; r^2dr + [\tfrac{v^2r^2}{2}]_{r=0}^{r=R} \\ &\geq -\Big(\int_0^R v^2r^2dr\int_0^R(\partial_r v)^2r^2dr\Big)^{1/2} + [\tfrac{v^2r^2}{2}]_{r=0}^{r=R} \\ &\geq -\tfrac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_0^R v^2r^2dr - \tfrac{\epsilon}{2}\int_0^R(\partial_r v)^2r^2dr + [\tfrac{v^2r^2}{2}]_{r=0}^{r=R} \end{aligned}$$

and integrate the representation $v^2(R)R = v^2(\rho)R + \int_\rho^R 2v\partial_r v R dr$ to estimate the last term

$$\begin{aligned} v^2(R)\tfrac{R^2}{2} &= \int_{R/2}^R v^2(r)Rdr + \int_{R/2}^R\int_\rho^R 2v\partial_r v R dr d\rho \\ &\geq \int_{R/2}^R v^2(r)Rdr - \int_{R/2}^R \Big(\int_\rho^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 R^{-1} dr \int_\rho^R v^2 R^3 r^{-2} dr\Big)^{1/2} d\rho \\ &\geq \int_{R/2}^R v^2(r)Rdr - \tfrac{\epsilon}{4}\int_{R/2}^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 dr - \tfrac{1}{4\epsilon}\int_{R/2}^R v^2 \tfrac{R^4}{r^4} r^2 dr \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$-\int_0^R \tfrac{1}{|x^j - X^n|} v^2 r^2 dr \quad \geq -\epsilon \int_0^R (\partial_r v)^2 r^2 dr - \tfrac{5}{\epsilon}\int_0^R v^2 \tfrac{R^4}{r^4} r^2 dr.$$

Similar bounds for the other interaction terms in V implies that the bilinear form is coercive

$$\begin{aligned} &\textstyle\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v\bar{V}_\tau v + \gamma v^2 \; dx dX_0 \\ &\geq \textstyle\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} \frac{1}{4}\sum_{j=1}^J |\partial_{x^j} v|^2 + \frac{1}{4M}\sum_{n=1}^N |\partial_{X^n} v|^2 + v^2 \; dx dX_0, \end{aligned}$$

for $\gamma \geq 60(MN + J)$. Analogous estimates show that the bilinear form is also continuous, i.e. there is a constant C such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1}} v\bar{V}_\tau w + \gamma v w \; dx dX_0 \leq C\|v\|_{H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1})}\|w\|_{H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1})}.$$

The combination of coercivity and continuity in $H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$ implies, by the theory of compact operators, that the spectrum of $\bar{V}$ consists of eigenvalues with orthogonal eigenvectors in $L^2(\mathbf{T}^{3(J+N)-1})$, see [18].

Remark 9.1 (The Madelungen equation)**.** An alternative to (2.7) is to instead include the coupling term $-\frac{1}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi$ in the eikonal equation, which leads to the so called Madelungen equations [39]. Near the minima points, where $E - V_0(X) = 0$, the perturbation $-\psi \cdot \frac{1}{2M}\sum_j \Delta_{X^j}\psi$ can be negative and then there is no real solution $\partial_X\theta$ to the corresponding eikonal equation. To have a non real velocity $\partial_X\theta$ is in our case not compatible with a classical limit and therefore we avoid the Madelungen formulation.

References

[1] Barles G., *Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi*, Springer-Verlag (1994)

[2] Bardi M. and Capuzzo-Dolcetta I., *Optimal Control and Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations*, Birkäuser (1997)

[3] Berezin F.A. and Shubin M.A., *The Schrödinger Equation*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1991)

[4] Briggs J. and Rost J.M., *On the derivation of the time-dependent equation of Schrödinger*, Foundations of Physics, **31** 693-712 (2001)

[5] Briggs J. Boonchui S. and Khemmani S., *The derivation of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** 1289-1302 (2007)

[6] Born M. and Oppenheimer R., *Zur Quantentheorie der Molekeln*, Ann. Physik **84** 457-484 (1927)

[7] Bornemann F.A., Nettesheim P. and Schütte C., *Quantum-classical molecular dynamics as an approximation to full quantum dynamics*, J. Chem. Phys, **105** 1074–1083 (1996)

[8] Bouzounia A. and Robert D., *Uniform semiclassical estimates for the propagation of quantum observables*, Duke Math. J., **111** 223-252 (2002)

[9] Cances E., Legoll F. and Stolz G., *Theoretical and numerical comparison of some sampling methods for molecular dynamics*, Math. Model. Num. Anal., **41** 351-389 (2007)

[10] Cances E., Defranceschi M., Kutzelnigg W., LeBris C. and Maday Y., *Computational Chemistry: a primer, Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, X, North-Holland (2003)

[11] Cano B. and Stuart A.M. *Under-resolved simulations of heat-baths*, J. Comp. Phys. **169** 193–214 (2001)

[12] Carlsson J., Sandberg M. and Szepessy A., *Symplectic Pontryagin approximations for optimal design*, ESAIM: M2AN **43** 3-32 (2009)

[13] Dimassi M. and Sjöstrand J., *Spectral Asymptotics in the Semiclassical Limit*, London Mathematical Society, Lecture Note Series 268. Cambridge University Press (1999)

[14] Duistermaat J. J., *Fourier Integral Operators*, Courant Institute (1973)

[15] Dürr D., Goldstein S. and Lebowitz, J.L., *A mechanical model for the Brownian motion of a convex body*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheori verw. Gebiete, **62** 427–448 (1983)

[16] Dürr D., Goldstein S. and Lebowitz, J.L., *A mechanical model of Brownian motion*, Commun. Math. Phys. **78** 507–530 (1981)
[17] Einstein A., *Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen*, Ann. Phys. **17** 549–560 (1905)
[18] Evans L.C., *Partial Differential Equation*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1998)
[19] Fefferman C. and Seco L., *Eigenvalues and Eigenfunctions of ordinary differential operators*, Adv. Math., **95** 145–305 (1992)
[20] Feynman R.F., *Statistical Mechanics: A Set of Lectures*, Westview Press (1998)
[21] Ford G. W. and Kac M., *On the quantum Langevin equation*, J. Statist. Phys. **46** 803–810 (1987)
[22] Ford G. W., Kac M. and Mazur P., *Statistical mechanics of assemblies of coupled oscillators*, J. Mathematical Phys. **6** 504–515 (1965)
[23] Frenkel D. and Smith B., *Understanding Molecular Simulation*, Academic Press (2002)
[24] Gardiner C.W., *Quantum Noise*, Springer-Verlag (1991)
[25] Gibbs J.W., *Elementary Principles in Statistical Mechanics*, New York, Charles Scribner's sons (1902)
[26] Hagedorn G.A., *A time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, Commun. Math. Phys., **77** 1–19 (1980)
[27] Hagedorn G.A., *High order corrections to the time-independent Born-Oppenheimer approximation II: diatomic Coulomb systems*, Commun. Math. Phys., **116** 23–44 (1988)
[28] Helffer B., *Semi-classical Analysis for the Schrödinger Operator and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1336 Springer Verlag (1988)
[29] Jeffreys H., *On certain approximate solutions of linear differential equations of the second order*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 23: 428436 (1924)
[30] Kadanoff L., *Statistical Physics: Statistics, Dynamics and Renormalization*, World Scientific (2000)
[31] Keller J. B., *Corrected Bohr-Sommerfeld quantum conditions for nonseparable systems*, Ann. Phys. **4** 180-188 (1958)
[32] Klein M., Martinez A., Seiler R. and Wang X.P., *On the Born-Oppenheimer expansion for polyatomic molecules*, Commun. Math. Phys. **143** 607–639 (1992)
[33] Kozlov V.V., *Thermodynamics of Hamiltonian systems and Gibbs distribution*, Doklady Mathematics, **61** (2000), 123-125. Translated from Doklady Academii Nauk. **370** 325-327 (2000)
[34] Langevin P., *On the theory of Brownian movement*, C.R.Acad. Sci. **146** 530 (1908), (translation Am. J. Phys. **65** 1079 (1997)
[35] Lasser C. and Röblitz S. em Computing expectations values for molecular quantum dynamics, preprint (2009)
[36] Le Bris C., *Computational chemistry from the perspective of numerical analysis.* Acta Numer. **14** 363–444 (2005)
[37] Lia X., Tully J.C., Schlegel H.B. and Frisch M.J., *Ab initio Ehrenfest dynamics*, J. Chem. Phys. **123** 084106 (2005)
[38] Lieb Elliot, *The stability of matter*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **48** 553-569 (1976)
[39] Madelung E., Z. Phys. **40** 322 (1926)
[40] Marx D. and Hutter J., *Ab initio molecular dynamics: Theory and implementation, Modern Methods and Algorithms of Quantum Chemistry*, J.Grotendorst(Ed.), John von Neumann Institute for Computing, Jülich, NIC Series, Vol. 1, ISBN 3-00-005618-1, 301–449 (2000)
[41] Maslov V. P. and Fedoriuk M. V., *Semi-Classical Approximation in Quantum Mechanics*, D. Reidel Publishing Company (1981)
[42] Mott N.F., Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **27** 553 (1931)
[43] Panati G., Spohn H. and Teufel S., *Space-adiabatic perturbation theory* Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7** 145-204 (2003)
[44] Panati G., Spohn H. and Teufel S., *The time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, Math. Mod. Numer. Anal. **41** 297-314 (2007)
[45] Rayleigh, *On the Propagation of Waves through a Stratified Medium, with Special Reference to the Question of Reflection*, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) Series A, **86** 207-226 (1912)
[46] Sandberg M., Szepessy A., *Convergence rates of symplectic Pontryagin approximations in optimal control theory*, Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **40** 149–173 (2006)
[47] Schiff L., *Quantum Mechanics*, McGraw-Hill (1968)
[48] Schrödinger E., *Collected papers on Wave Mechanics*, Blackie and Son, London (1928)
[49] Szepessy A., *Langevin molecular dynamics derived from Ehrenfest dynamics*, arXiv:0712.3656.
[50] Tanner D.J., *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics: A Time-dependent Perspective*, University Science Books (2006)
[51] Tully J.C., *Mixed quantum-classical dynamics*, Faraday Discuss., **110** 407–419 (1998)
[52] Zwanzig R., *Nonlinear generalized Langevin equations*, J. Stat. Phys. **9** 215–220 (1973)

Department of Mathematics, Kungl. Tekniska Högskolan, 100 44 Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail address: szepessy@kth.se